OFFICIAL REPORT

OF THE

DEBATES

OF THE

HOUSE OF COMMONS

OF THE

DOMINION OF CANADA

SEVENTH SESSION—TWELFTH PARLIAMENT

7-8 GEORGE V, 1917

IN SIX VOLUMES

Vol. I—Pages . .	1-1124	Vol. IV—Pages . .	3187-4242
II " . .	1125-2138	V " . .	4243-5270
III " . .	2139-3186	VI " . .	5271-6094

VOLUME CXXXI

COMPRISING THE PERIOD FROM THE EIGHTEENTH DAY OF JANUARY TO THE TWENTIETH DAY OF SEPTEMBER, 1917, INCLUSIVE.



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

CANADA

House of Commons Debates

OFFICIAL REPORT.

Monday, September 3, 1917.

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

QUESTIONS.

[Questions answered orally are indicated by asterisks.]

IMPERIAL MUNITIONS BOARD EMPLOYEES.

*Mr. LANCTOT:

1. How many men, officers and employees of the Imperial Munitions Board are of military age?
2. What are their names and respective salaries?
3. Who, if any, have military badges, and on what grounds in each case have they been granted?

Sir ROBERT BORDEN: The information asked for in this question is not available. The Imperial Munitions Board is under the control and direction of the Government of the United Kingdom, and it is not under the control or direction of the Government of Canada, which exercises no direction or control whatever with respect to the employment of persons who are in the service of that Board.

THE MOTOR BOAT SCOUT.

*Mr. A. K. MACLEAN (Halifax):

1. Was a steamer or motor boat, called the Scout, purchased by the Government of Canada from any person or persons at Halifax, N.S.?
2. If so, from whom, when was she purchased, and what was the price paid therefor?

Mr. MEIGHEN:

1. No.

Mr. A. K. MACLEAN: The name of the motor boat mentioned in this question, the Scout, is an error and I wrote the minister a few days ago giving the correct name of the boat. I wish to know if the answer is to the question as amended?

Mr. MEIGHEN: I did not know about the amendment of the question. The answer is to the question as it stands.

Mr. A. K. MACLEAN: I promised to give the correct name privately.

Mr. MEIGHEN: If the hon. member gives me the correct name I shall answer.

THE MILITARY SERVICE ACT, 1917.

*Mr. KYTE:

Is it the intention of the Government to amend the Military Service Act, 1917, by Order in Council or any other way, to provide for the exemption from the calling out on active service provided for by section 4 of said Act of those engaged in agriculture or of those engaged in industrial or other work which provides material for the war?

Sir ROBERT BORDEN: It is believed that the provisions of the Military Service Act of 1917 make adequate arrangements for the exemption of all persons necessarily required for agriculture, or other essential industries.

OFFICERS OF THE 66th FUSILIERS.

Mr. J. J. HUGHES:

1. How many Lieutenant-Colonels are attached to the 66th Princess Louise Fusiliers at Halifax?
2. On what dates were each of said Colonels appointed?
3. What is the rate of pay and allowance to each?
4. Are all of said Colonels giving their entire time to the performance of their duties?

Sir EDWARD KEMP:

1 and 2. The usual number of officers are employed with the 66th Princess Louise Fusiliers at Halifax which is on active service, namely:

Acting Commanding Officer Lt.-Col. A. King, appointed August 9, 1915, in command of the 66th Regiment, vice Lt.-Col. H. L. Chipman, seconded, which Regiment, since the beginning of the war, has been on active service in connection with Halifax defences.

Temporary Lt.-Col. R. B. Simmonds, Senior Major, 2nd in Command, appointed August 11, 1914. (Lt.-Col. Simmonds draws Major's pay.)

REVISED EDITION

The Medical Officer of this Regiment is Hon. Lt.-Col. M. A. Currie, appointed December 14, 1904.

The Chaplain of this Regiment is Hon. Lt.-Col. the Rev. W. J. Armitage, appointed April 16, 1913, whose services, owing to the Regiment's isolation, are required.

The Commanding Officer of this Battalion is Lt.-Col. H. L. Chipman, appointed 3rd May, 1910. This officer, however, is not at present in active command of the 66th Princess Louise Fusiliers, as he was seconded to command the Composite Battalion stationed at Wellington Barracks, Halifax, on the 9th August, 1915.

3 and 4. The pay of Lt.-Col. A. King and Lt.-Col. H. L. Chipman, when on active service, is $5 per diem, with subsistence allowance of $1.50 per diem, and field allowance of $1.25 per diem, and that of temporary Lt.-Col. R. B. Simmonds (who draws Major's pay) is $4 per diem, with field allowance of $1 per diem and subsistence allowance of $1.50 per diem. These three officers give their whole time to their military duties.

The pay of Hon. Lt.-Col. M. A. Currie, Medical Officer, when on active service, is $4 per diem, with $1 per diem field allowance and $1.50 per diem subsistence allowance. This officer gives six hours a day to military duty.

The pay of Hon. Lt.-Col. the Rev. W. J. Armitage, when on active service, is $5 per diem, with no allowances. This officer also performs certain duties as rector of St. Paul's Church, Halifax.

ENGLISH AND FRENCH-SPEAKING MAIL CLERKS.

Mr. EDWARDS:

1. Is it correct, as reported at a convention of mail clerks, that when from twenty-five to thirty of these English-speaking clerks in Ontario enlisted, their places in the province of Ontario to as far west as Sarnia were filled by able-bodied French Canadians?

2. Could returned soldiers not have been obtained to fill the vacancies caused by the enlistment of those English-speaking clerks?

Mr. DOHERTY:

1. No. Only one French Canadian employed in Ontario to replace mail clerks who enlisted, and he had been discharged as medically unfit.

2. Returned soldiers were obtained in every case where it was possible to get them.

LIEUTENANT JOHN D. McNEILL.

Mr. CARROLL:

1. Has Lieutenant John D. McNeill, of the 25th Battalion, C.E.F., formerly of Whitney Pier, Sydney, been promoted to the rank of captain?

2. If so, when?

[Sir Edward Kemp.]

Sir EDWARD KEMP:

1. Appointed Acting Captain 25th September, 1916; authority London Gazette.

2. Particulars of date and number of Gazette not yet received.

MR. ISIDORE LACASSE.

*Mr. DELISLE:

1. Was Mr. Isidore Lacasse, of St. Henedine, employed in the Department of Public Works at the City of Quebec?

2. If so, did he resign?

Mr. REID: The answer to each of these questions is, No.

167th BATTALION.

Mr. DELISLE:

1. Has Mr. Payne been commissioned to make an inquiry in the matter of the officers of the 167th Battalion?

2. If so, how long is it since he was so commissioned to make this inquiry?

3. What is his salary, and what is his profession?

Sir EDWARD KEMP:

1 and 2. No. Mr. Payne was employed to assist the Deputy Inspector General in his inquiry.

3. Mr. Payne is a hand-writing expert, and, on the advice of the Department of Justice, his services were loaned by the Post Office Department on the 29th of June, last. This department has no official knowledge as to his salary. He is a civil servant employed in the Post Office Department.

Mr. DELISLE:

1. Have Lieutenant-Colonel J. T. Langton and Major Deaken been commissioned this year to make an inquiry at Quebec in the matter of the 167th Battalion?

2. If so, has the said inquiry taken place, and have the officers of the said battalion been heard?

3. At whose request had the said inquiry been granted?

4. What has been the result of this inquiry?

Sir EDWARD KEMP:

1, 2, 3 and 4. An investigation into the affairs of the 167th Battalion was applied for by the Officer Commanding, and also by the Pay Department Branch of the Inspector General. As the investigation concerned matters of pay, canteen and regimental funds, it was not necessary to go to the expense of holding a court of inquiry, as there are officers specially appointed at militia headquarters for this purpose, and an investigation was made by Colonel Langton, deputy inspector general, at the beginning of this year.

This investigation disclosed grave irregularities. The matter was, accordingly, re-

ferred to the Department of Justice, in order that it might take the necessary action.

QUESTIONS PASSED AS ORDERS FOR RETURNS.

Mr. DELISLE:

1. How many Government employees from the county of Dorchester have been given employment since 1916, to date?
2. What are their names, the nature of their employment, and their respective salaries?
3. Has the Government raised the salaries of any of its employees from the county of Dorchester since the month of December, 1916?
4. If so, what are the names and the amount of their respective increases?

Mr. DELISLE:

1. How many post offices have been opened in the County of Dorchester since December, 1916, and what are the names and salaries of the Postmasters?
2 Has the Government given new contracts for the carrying of mails in the county of Dorchester since the month of December, 1916?
3. If so, to whom, and for what amount?

Mr. HUGHES (Kings):

1. What are the names and addresses of the medical men now employed or who have been employed by the Government or the Militia Department in Prince Edward Island since August, 1914, to August, 1917, in connection with recruiting or any other military work?
2. What pay or allowance is received by each of these medical men, per day, per month or per year, and what is paid to them for each recruit examined?
3. What is the total amount received by each of these medical men since the beginning of the war to the 1st of August, 1917, both in salary and for examination of recruits?

RELEASE OF THOMAS KELLY.

Mr. LEMIEUX:

For a copy of all letters, telegrams, petitions and other documents addressed to the Minister of Justice concerning the release from penitentiary of Thomas Kelly, contractor of Winnipeg, sentenced by Judge Prendergast to two and a half years in the penitentiary for obtaining money, approximating $1,000,000, in connection with the construction of the Manitoba Parliament Buildings.

Mr. SPEAKER: The mover of this motion proposes an amendment, which I should like to submit to the Minister of Justice. It is proposed to add after the word "justice" in the second line, the following:

Which, in the judgment of the minister, in conformity with the usual practice in such cases may properly be brought down.

Amendment agreed to.

Sir ROBERT BORDEN: I move that all the words after the word "penitentiary" in the fourth line of the motion be struck out. They add nothing to the information asked for.

Amendment agreed to.

Motion as amended agreed to.

UNOPPOSED MOTIONS FOR PAPERS.

Mr. Kyte—For a return showing the names and addresses of recruiting officers employed in the province of Nova Scotia since August 4, 1914, with the respective amounts of pay per day. And showing the total amount received by each of said officers on account of such pay and the respective amounts received by each for expenses and outlay.

Mr. A. K. Maclean—For a return showing the names of all the officers of the R.C.N., or R.N., employed at H.M.C. dockyard and on H.M.C.S. Niobe, and in the Naval Service at Halifax. Also a list of the names of captains and officers employed in patrol service, showing the salaries and nature of employment, respectively.

Mr. Macdonald—For a copy of all letters, papers, telegrams and all other documents relative to the application of the Souris Packing Company of Charlottetown, P.E.I., for storage facilities for a quantity of hams and bacon in order to save it from destruction?

Mr. Fortier—For a detailed statement of the amount paid Colonel Rev. Dr. A. E. Burke since his appointment as a chaplain, including items for travelling and hotel expenses.

PRIVILEGE—HON. MR. PUGSLEY.

On the Orders of the Day:

Hon. WILLIAM PUGSLEY (St. John City): Mr. Speaker, I rise to a question of privilege. On August 31 I made some remarks in the House in regard to the distress caused by the high cost of living. I have noticed in several newspapers the statement that I said that a great many people had been thrown out of employment. I do not know how the statement came to be made, because I made no reference whatever to people being thrown out of employment, nor did I intend to make any such suggestion. My remarks were directed to the hardship caused by the high cost of living.

SALES OF FLOUR BETWEEN CANADA AND UNITED STATES.

On the Orders of the Day:

Hon. FRANK OLIVER (Edmonton): I desire to direct the attention of the Government to a report appearing in The Modern Miller, of St. Louis, U.S.A. The report says:

Canada officially, by legislation, removed the duty on both wheat and flour some months ago, which automatically removed the United States duties against Canadian wheat and flour under

our last Tariff Act. Then the Canadian food controller prohibited wheat exports and this left flour officially free to enter the United States from Canada. Canadian millers were not slow to act and a large amount of flour was shipped from Canadian mills to eastern markets. This resulted in the United States Millers' Committee suggesting to W. J. Hanna, Canadian food controller, that they were prepared to recommend to United States millers an agreement to be effected with Canadian millers prohibiting sales of flour between the two countries during the period of the war. In response Mr. Hanna advised he is entirely in sympathy and it is to be assumed that satisfactory arrangements will be made.

I desire to ask the Government whether such arrangements have been made.

Sir ROBERT BORDEN: No such arrangements have been made. I was not aware that any such proposal had been made to the food controller as that which the hon. gentleman has mentioned. The statement set forth in this news item comes to me for the first time to-day.

REMOVAL OF DUTY UPON POTATOES PROPOSED.

On the Orders of the Day:

Mr. F. B. CARVELL (Carleton): The Government by Order in Council have given wheat and wheat products free entry into the United States, but they have not carried out that principle with regard to potatoes, which, under the United States tariff, are in the same category as wheat and wheat products. There is an enormous crop of potatoes in central Canada, where our principal market is, and I would ask the Government to take into consideration, as a war measure, the advisability of placing potatoes on the free list in order that we may have the advantage of selling our potatoes in the United States markets.

Sir ROBERT BORDEN: We will give our best consideration to what the hon. gentleman has suggested. If there should be any announcement, it will be made in due course.

ATLANTIC PATROL SERVICE.

On the Orders of the Day:

Mr. A. K. MACLEAN (Halifax): I desire to ask the Minister of Naval Service (Hon. J. D. Hazen) whether the patrol service at Halifax and Sydney, Nova Scotia, is a Canadian or an Imperial establishment? If it is a Canadian establishment, to what extent is it to be developed and enlarged?

Hon. J. D. HAZEN (Minister of Naval Service): It may be correctly said that the service is partly Canadian and party Imperial. There is a section of the patrol service which is under the control of Imperial officers; another is under the control of the Canadian Naval Department. In respect of certain parts of the service, it might be said that there is mixed control.

BACON AND LARD PURCHASES IN CANADA.

On the Orders of the Day:

Hon. FRANK OLIVER (Edmonton): On Saturday I directed the attention of the Government to a report in regard to the cessation of the purchase of bacon by the British Government. In the absence of the Minister of Trade and Commerce (Sir George Foster) the Minister of Finance (Sir Thomas White) said that possibly the Minister of Trade and Commerce would be able to give an answer at a later date.

Sir ROBERT BORDEN: We are in communication with the British Government, through the Acting High Commissioner, on this question. Pending the receipt of a reply, there is no announcement to be made.

PRIVILEGE—HON. MR. HAZEN.

On the Orders of the Day:

Hon. J. D. HAZEN (Minister of Marine and Fisheries): I should like to correct a statement which was made in the Committee of the House by my hon. colleague from St. John (Mr. Pugsley) on Saturday. The subject under discussion was the appointment of Mr. M. G. Teed as counsel for Sir Ezekiel McLeod in the McLeod-Tellier investigation. I quote from page 5569 of Hansard:

> Mr. Crothers: Who employed him?
> Mr. Pugsley: I have no doubt the Minister of Marine and Fisheries (Mr. Hazen) suggested his appointment.

On the following page, 5570, the report reads:

> Mr. Meighen: The hon. member for Carleton (Mr. Carvell) said that he was appointed by Chief Justice McLeod, and he was right. Why would Chief Justice McLeod appoint him if he thought he was favourable to this Government?
> Mr. Pugsley: I have no doubt he was recommended by the Minister of Marine and Fisheries.

I simply rise to say that I neither suggested nor recommended Mr. Teed's appointment to Chief Justice McLeod, to any member of the Government, or to any one else. I know of my own personal knowledge that the suggestion for his appointment came from the Chief Justice, Sir Ezekiel McLeod himself.

SUPPLY BILL—THIRD READING.

On motion of Sir Thomas White (Minister of Finance), Bill No. 128, for granting to His Majesty certain sums of money for the public service for the financial year ending the 31st March, 1918, was read the second time, considered in committee, reported, read the third time, and passed.

GAME IN NORTHWEST TERRITORIES.

Hon. W. J. ROCHE (Minister of Interior) moved concurrence in certain amendments made by the Senate to Bill No. 100, respecting game in the Northwest Territories of Canada.

Sir WILFRID LAURIER: This Bill is very technical. I suppose the amendments have been made for a purpose. Are they satisfactory to the minister?

Mr. ROCHE: Yes.

Sir WILFRID LAURIER: The only important change is the amendment in section 4 changing the close season for the hunting and killing of moose, deer and mountain goats. I presume my hon. friend has looked into the matter and is satisfied that the period suggested is preferable to the one contained in the Bill as it passed this House.

Mr. ROCHE: The officials of my department assure me that it is all right.

Mr. OLIVER: Would the minister state shortly the effect of this amendment?

Mr. ROCHE: The difference made by the amendment is this: in our paragraph (a) of section 4, we have the following arrangements for the close season: moose, caribou, deer, mountain sheep and mountain goats between the 1st day of April and the 15th day of July and between the 1st day of October and the 1st day of December. The Senate have amended that so that the close season is:

> Moose, deer, and mountain goat between the 1st day of April and the 1st day of September.

That is, they are extending the time from the 15th of July to the 1st of September. As regards caribou and mountain sheep, they are adding to the close season already provided for in the Bill, the period from the 1st of April to the 1st of August.

Amendments concurred in.

SUPPLY.

The House in Committee of Supply, Mr. Rainville in the Chair.

Trade and Commerce—Imperial Year Book of Canada, $4,000.

Mr. MURPHY: Will the minister explain what this publication is?

Sir GEORGE FOSTER: This publication, which is now in its third edition, is called The Imperial Year Book because it publishes statistics of the whole Empire. If my hon. friend has seen either of the two previous editions he will appreciate the completeness and scope of the work. The third edition, a book of about six hundred pages, is now in the press and will soon be ready for distribution. I have seen a good many of these year books, but this is one of the fullest and most complete of which I have knowledge. In all, 7,500 copies are to be issued. Of these, we issue 2,500 copies under our own direction, and the others are issued under the advisement of the Government; that is, a list is submitted to the Government for its approval.

Mr. MURPHY: Did we purchase copies of the previous issues?

Sir GEORGE FOSTER: Yes.

Mr. MURPHY: Who publishes it?

Sir GEORGE FOSTER: The author of it is in Montreal. The soul and body of the work is Mr. Southall. The book has been very highly commended, and I have received numerous requests that we should help it through this war year, which, of course, is a pretty difficult year. A number of copies will be sent to our consuls and trade commissioners for distribution to such bodies as they see fit. Boards of trade, chambers of commerce, libraries and similar institutions, both in the English-speaking world and outside, but mainly in the English-speaking world, will receive copies of the book. Altogether, I think this is an appropriation which will be exceedingly useful in its results.

Sir WILFRID LAURIER: I must confess that I am ignorant of this book. I do not know whether a copy has ever reached me. Is it a book of statistics on the British Empire?

Sir GEORGE FOSTER: Purely statistical from beginning to end.

Sir WILFRID LAURIER: Relating to trade navigation and commerce, etc.?

Sir GEORGE FOSTER: Yes. It touches every department of our administrative work.

Mr. MURPHY: Is it printed at the Printing Bureau?

Sir GEORGE FOSTER: No, it is not a government work. We are simply buying copies.

Bureau of Industrial and Scientific Research—Salaries and expenses, including printing and stationery, and the collection and distribution of information, $43,600.

Sir WILFRID LAURIER: "Salaries and expenses, including printing and stationery," is a very elastic term.

Sir GEORGE FOSTER: It has to be elastic. My hon. friend understands the organization of the advisory council. It consists of eleven members, who, with one exception, are all giving their services gratis. The administrative commissioner, Professor MacCallum, receives a salary of $10,000. This item of $43,600 is for the travelling expenses of the council, and expenses incurred in gathering information and making their investigations. As regards studentships, we are following the plan which has been adopted by the advisory council in Great Britain and elsewhere. The idea is to get hold of those students who are just about ready to leave the university, and who have proved themselves during a collegiate or scientific course of any kind to be particularly adapted for investigation along a certain line. The studentship is $600 for the first year, and $750 for the second year if a second year is added.

Mr. MURPHY: Is that to maintain them at the university?

Sir GEORGE FOSTER: I will explain it. In order to get a studentship these young men must continue their investigations along a line which must be approved by the advisory council. Full inquiry is made into the student's antecedents, the work he has done, and his ability in the particular line of inquiry in which he is engaged. If that is a line of inquiry which commends itself to the advisory council as likely to prove useful and advantageous in connection with the industries of the country, they may approve of such an one for a studentship. The university gives him the run of the university during the year of his studentship; that is, he has the advantage of the laboratory and whatever is necessary in his investigation. That is the contribution on the part of the university toward that year's work, and the studentship of $600 is granted to induce him to carry on his investigation for the year. If, at the end of that year, after thorough examination and supervision by the advisory council, it is found that he has made much progress in that line of his work that it promises to yield beneficial results for practical purposes in the industry to which it is allied, a second year scholarship may be given under the same conditions and carried out in much the same way, except that it is not necessary for this second year's work to be carried on all the while in the university; the student may be transferred to a large industrial concern where he can carry on his investigations in connection with the actual work of the industry itself. In the United States and Great Britain it is considered to be an essential part of the work of the student that a certain amount of time should be devoted to this work in the atmosphere and amidst the practical surroundings of the industry to which his investigation is allied. A student or a fellow has to promise that he will devote his work and his ability to our own country. It is a rather pitiful comment that nine-tenths of possibly the brightest scientific students who have been developed in our country have gone to other countries to carry out the practical results of their work, many of them to the United States. There are students who have thus gone out from our colleges who to-day, in the United States, are drawing salaries of anywhere from $5,000 to $20,000. That is the talent we need to keep in our own country, so far as possible; it is the kind of talent which is now, more than ever before, absolutely necessary to the development of our industries on the lines of competition, with the saving and resulting effects that come from the application of close scientific knowledge to the industry itself. As an example of the kind of investigation contemplated, one of these aids is to be bestowed on an investigation now going on in the University of Saskatchewan as to the possibility of utilizing straw for the purpose of making gas. As a by product of the making of gas out of straw there is quite a large percentage of valuable oil. These investigations have been going on under one of the professors in the Saskatchewan University, and one of our aids will be given to assist in bringing that, if possible, to an ultimate and successful conclusion, so that the vast quantities of straw now mostly wasted in the West (although part of it is eaten by young cattle) may be utilized in heating and lighting and producing motive power for the people on the prairies.

Mr. PUGSLEY: When was the bureau established?

Sir GEORGE FOSTER: A year ago last June.

Mr. PUGSLEY: The minister has stated that among the salaries there is one of $10,000 to Dr. MacCallum. What other salaries are paid out of the $43,000?

Sir GEORGE FOSTER: Dr. MacCallum, the administrative chairman, is the only salaried one of the advisory council. We have a secretary of the council who is an officer of the Department of the Interior. This gentleman has offered his services free of charge to the advisory council this year as secretary, and he is carrying out that work excellently. He divides his time between his duties in the Interior Department and his duties for the council, working particularly in the evenings for the council. I refer to Mr. Challies, who is a most valuable secretary at this juncture. He is thoroughly conversant with the water-power system of the Dominion, and his knowledge of this and cognate subjects has been of great assistance. Outside of that we pay no salaries except for the clerical and stenographic help that is required. I think I can say to the committee that probably the most important work now being carried out is the issuing of sets of questionnaires to the colleges and universities, to the scientific societies and associations, and to the industrial establishments of the country, to ascertain the facilities and resources for research which now exist, and by whom and to what extent they are being utilized. Going out into the wider fields of industry to get this information from the industries, we ask: what are the problems which meet you in the development of your industry, whether it is some operation in connection with steel, or gas, or water-power, or any of the many problems that come up. It is desired to get a tabulation of all that information. All these questionnaires have been sent out but, as I explained the other day, the sending out of the questionnaires will not be the only means adopted to obtain the information desired. The Mining Institute, the Manufacturers' Association, the Chemical Association and other societies have volunteered their own personal work in seeing that a question, as it is directed to any establishment, shall be understood and answered. They have perfected their organization and they have engaged in actively supervising and facilitating the collection of that information, from 500 to 600 persons. All this work is done voluntarily and out of the good will of these societies, the whole of it being destined to bring that basis of information in a collated form in which it can be made the groundwork for subsequent action. When these answers come in and the advisory council find what these problems are, they analyse the problems by means of their various committees. They select those of them which they consider the most important for solution and they, having the knowledge of, the facilities, and the resources for investigation, distribute each problem to the resources of research which is working along that particular line. Another important investigation which they are supervising at the present time has reference to the tar sands of the West which have already been under investigation by the western universities. This investigation will be aided to a certain extent from this vote.

Mr. MURPHY: Do I understand the minister to say that Mr. Challies, or his work, will be assisted out of this vote?

Sir GEORGE FOSTER: I said that Mr. Challies was anxious to do what he could in this way and that he had offered his services for a year during the war period free of charge.

Mr. KNOWLES: The item of "special problems" seems to be nebulous for me to give my support to. Anything in the world can be included in it and the minister's remarks have left me in a more nebulous condition mentally than when I first glanced at the item. The people's money is very precious now-a-days. This money has to be taken from the people and it seems to me that the special problem that everybody has to deal with now is to know where to get the money to pay the taxes rather than to increase the taxes by an artificial expenditure on an academic matter called the solving of special problems. If you are going to solve the problems of this country it will take a great deal more money than the sum that the minister has placed before the committee. I would think that the greatest problems now confronting this country are the servant girl problem, the bi-lingual problem, and the conscription problem. Why should we toy with the people's money in an era of high prices by undertaking investigation and research work into such purely academic and nebulous matters as are described here as special problems? All levity aside, the most pressing problem with which this country is now confronted and one to which this money might well

4 p.m.

be devoted is the war. I think the minister might very well drop this nebulous and mystic thing called "special problems."

Sir GEORGE FOSTER: I am sure that my hon. friend (Mr. Knowles) has not done himself justice when he puts this forward to the committee as a sober criticism of an item for a purpose of this kind. I will leave it to the committee to say if it thinks that he has. No one expected that this money was to come from any other source than the source from which money generally comes. It has to be raised by the different methods by which revenues are raised and appropriated to its different purposes. If my hon. friend will do a little reading—I am sure he does a great deal—and a little thinking; which but for this exhibition I would have supposed he did a good deal of —he will see that there is no progressive nation in the world to-day which is not putting a tremendous amount of its force into these very things. Great Britain, as most other nations, the United States not excepted, found when this war opened and communications were cut, what she has lost in the preceding ten or twenty years in not pursuing problems like this and making them concrete. She found that she was practically helpless in reference to some of the most basic needs of the country. She woke up and woke up mighty quickly to the necessity of seeing that such should not happen again. This Bureau of Industrial and Scientific Research is formed upon the same plan as the advisory council in Great Britain. At present the advisory council has connected with it the best talent and the best advisory committees in all these different lines of scientific and practical business and industrial knowledge that Great Britain can afford. The British Government have put behind that council £1,000,000 for expenditures along lines tending in this very same direction. I do not think I ought to take up the time of the committee in replying to the little flight of criticism of my hon. friend. It would not be fair to him and it would not be fair to the committee. He did not do himself justice in making that criticism and no other in respect to this matter and I am sure he would feel that way too himself. I do not want to make him feel too badly and I shall not say any more about it.

Mr. CARROLL: I understand that these studentships and fellowships are for the purpose of investigating special problems but I did not understand what the $25,000 was for.

[Mr. Knowles.]

Sir GEORGE FOSTER: There are studentships and fellowships and then there are special problems which are to be attacked.

Mr. CARROLL: I understand about the studentships and fellowships.

Sir GEORGE FOSTER: They are really processes by which the students as students always have to progress in their researches. Whilst engaged in research work upon any line, if they are successful we get the practical result of that investigation but they are still perfecting themselves along lines of research and learning to be successful investigators. In that line of research, carried on after a university course of one or two years, they might light upon certain solutions and they might be very successful in that way. But the problems, one of two of which I mentioned, are to be undertaken by men who are expert researchers, and the vote of $25,000 is to provide for this work.

Mr. CARROLL: The University of Saskatchewan is investigating the various purposes for which straw may be utilized. Is that, for example, a special problem, to which a portion of this $25,000 will go?

Sir GEORGE FOSTER: In that particular case, I think, if I remember rightly, it is to provide an analyst for the professor who has been carrying on the investigation for a year or more.

Sir WILFRID LAURIER: I understand these students are to be selected from among the most proficient in certain lines of study; will they be selected by Professor Macallum?

Sir GEORGE FOSTER: These gentlemen who make up the advisory council are really representatives of our universities, where scientific courses are carried on, as for instance, McGill, Kingston and the others. The council gets into communication, in the best way they can, with all the local students who are approaching their final terms in these different universities, and gets their history from the university authorities. By that process of inquiry, and often by actual interview of some member of the advisory council with these young men, they obtain the information. Of course, every young man carries on these studies in the university under the superintendence of some professor or expert, and the council gets the report from the professor or expert as to the young man's work. Something depends, too, upon the kind of investigation which the young man is carrying on. With reference to some

lines of investigation the advisory council would say: That is all very well for pure science, but we want to get hold of what attaches itself particularly to the uses of industrial work; your line of investigation is good in its way, but we will not take that. They have the power to make their choice, and in that way they come to their conclusions as to who shall receive these studentships.

Mr. PUGSLEY: Would the minister kindly state in what line of work Professor MacCallum has achieved distinction? The minister might also tell us who comprise the advisory board.

Sir GEORGE FOSTER: I thought my hon. friend understood all about it, and I did not want to bother him with it.

Mr. PUGSLEY: I think it is well to publish it.

Sir GEORGE FOSTER: I have already read it in the House.

Mr. PUGSLEY: Does it appear on Hansard?

Sir GEORGE FOSTER: Yes. The administrative chairman is A. B. MacCallum, M.D., Ph.D., Sc.D., LL.D., F.R.S., Ottawa.

Sir WILFRID LAURIER: What do all these letters mean?

Mr. GRAHAM: We want an interpretation clause.

Sir GEORGE FOSTER: I do not want to make the matter too easy for the hon. gentlemen opposite. The members of the council are: F. D. Adams, Ph.D., Sc.D., LL.D., F.R.S. Dean, Faculty of Applied Science, McGill University, Montreal; T. Bienvenu, Esq., vice-president and general manager, La Banque Provinciale du Canada, Montreal; R. Hobson, Esq., president Steel Company of Hamilton, Ont.; S. F. Kirkpatrick, M.Sc., professor metallurgy, Queen's University, Kingston, Ont.; J. C. McLennan, Ph.D., F.R.S., professor of physics and director of the physics laboratory, University of Toronto, Toronto; A. S. Mackenzie, Ph.D., D.C.L., president Dalhousie University, Halifax, N.S.; W. C. Murray, M.A., LL.D., president University of Saskatchewan, Saskatoon, Saskatchewan; R. A. Ross, Esq., E.E. (Tor.), M. Can. Soc. C.E., consulting engineer, 80 St. Francois Xavier street, Montreal; R. F. Ruttan, M.A., M.D., Sc.D., professor of chemistry and director of the chemical laboratories, McGill University, Montreal; Arthur Surveyer, B.A.Sc., M. Can. Soc. C.E., consulting engineer, 274 Beaver Hall Hill, Montreal; secretary, J. B. Challies, CE. (Tor.), M. Can. Soc. C.E., superintendent Dominion Water-Power Branch, Ottawa.

Mr. PUGSLEY: By whom were these gentlemen appointed?

Sir GEORGE FOSTER: The Governor in Council. I may say that Dr. McLennan, professory of physics in Toronto, is now in England, and the advisory council have appointed him to represent them on the advisory council there. The advantage which we get, and which they get from that is this: he meets with them and they have information of all that we are doing here along this line, and he gets information from them as to how they are carrying on their work on the other side. It is an interchange of information, of ideas, and of suggestions.

Mr. PUGSLEY: My hon. friend, instead of answering my question, gave a long list of handles to Dr. MacCallum. One was that he was a doctor of philosophy, and the other that he was a doctor of science, but in what line of work has he gained distinction? Is it in the line of applied science?

Sir THOMAS WHITE: He is one of the most distinguished scientific men in Canada. For many years he has been professor of pathology in the University of Toronto. He is a noted physiologist, and also a chemist of high standing. I do not know any better qualified man, from the standpoint of general scientific knowledge, in Canada than Professor MacCallum.

Mr. PUGSLEY: I am glad to learn that he has gained distinction in the work of chemistry, because I would suppose that is the most important work that this bureau would have to perform. I recognize the very great importance of it, and all that I was anxious to know was that the work was to be undertaken on practical lines.

Mr. MARCIL: Has the hon. minister mentioned any representative of Laval University on that board?

Sir GEORGE FOSTER: I have not. In preparing the list for the advisory council the desire was to obtain men from the universities, and to make the very best selection of scientific men along practical lines that could possibly be made, and, of course, it must be along scientific lines. Inquiry was made in reference to Laval University, I may inform my hon. friend,

but it was not found that that university had on its list any specially distinguished professor in the lines of work which we require in the advisory council.

Mr. MARCIL: I am surprised to hear the hon. gentleman say that, because Laval is affiliated with all the colleges in Quebec. To be told that there was not a man to be found in that university fit to serve on a council like this is news to me.

Sir GEORGE FOSTER: My hon. friend should not put it that way. A great number of men in Canada are fit to serve on a body like this, but we want only a restricted number, and we try to get those who will best make up that restricted number. I am informed that Mr. Surveyer is a graduate of Laval.

Mr. PUGSLEY: Is that the lawyer?

Sir GEORGE FOSTER: Thank Heaven, this is one board that is able to get along without a lawyer.

Mr. MARCIL: Laval occupies an unique position in this country. It is the university that first had a Royal charter in Canada; it is representative of one class of the population. In undertaking a work such as my hon. friend is now undertaking, I assume that he desires the co-operation of all the elements of the population. Laval has produced many distinguished men; some of them are to-day in Quebec colleges—men of high standing. They may be found also in the Royal Society of Canada and in other learned bodies. I am sure that if the minister will give the matter consideration, he will come to the conclusion that it would be good policy to include in this body a representative of Laval University.

Mr. OLIVER: At the risk of incurring the unfavourable criticism of the minister—

Sir GEORGE FOSTER: Do not be afraid of that.

Mr. OLIVER: —I take very much the same position as that taken by the member for Moosejaw (Mr. Knowles). I cannot help thinking that however meritorious this proposal may be or would be at any other time, this is not an appropriate time or occasion to introduce it. There is the foundation here of a large organization, involving the expenditure of a large amount of money —money that will be devoted more to organization than to the producing of results. At this time we cannot afford to spend money on anything but results. At a time when the requirements of the country are so immense, so urgent; when we are descending to the point of soliciting private help from individuals throughout the country for the carrying of our war burdens, we should not enter upon what the member for Moosejaw calls a nebulous scheme of scientific research. My hon. friend mentioned two matters that are of interest particularly to the prairie West. One is the discovery at Moosejaw of a method for the production of gas from straw. This is a matter of inventive genius; it is not in any way indebted to scientific research arrangements; it is not connected with this or any other similar proposal. My hon. friend now proposes to introduce a subsidiary matter in connection with that as an excuse for the establishment of this big organization. If he is desirous of carrying to success the extraction of various articles from the tar product of the gas, a small grant to the university of Saskatchewan will produce all the results in that particular that his proposed organization will produce. The same may be said with regard to the tar sand of the Athbaska. If my hon. friend is desirous of securing information that will lead to the utilization of the tar sand, a small grant to the university of Alberta would produce probably better results than would be produced under this organization that he proposes. The time is ill-judged for launching what will turn out to be a very expensive organization, whether it produces any results or not. The amount he asks for is not seriously large; it is the principle that I object to—the principle of introducing new expenditures and new causes for expenditure into the Budget at this time of stress and trial, when we are preaching, or assuming to preach, to the people the necessity of their saving in order that they may serve.

Sir GEORGE FOSTER: A grant is proposed to be given in reference to the extraction of benzine and toluene from coal gas by means of absorbents for the purpose of accurately determining the quantity of these compounds. There is in the coal gas product in the various cities and towns of this continent a considerable quantity of these two compounds, particularly of the first. These go to waste at the present time; they are valuable, and a solution of the problem would be of incalculable benefit. A grant is to be given to the University of Manitoba under the charge of one of its professors; that is the very thing that my hon. friend thinks we

ought to do. The grant is given under the supervision of the advisory council; it is not a subsidy to assist the university; it is a grant for a specific purpose. The separation of tar from the tar sand is another very important matter. If that problem could be solved, immense benefit would result to the western country. A grant of a small amount, about $1,500, is to be given to that university under the supervision of the proper professor—who is conversant with the question and who is carrying out an investigation at present—to enable him to carry his work to a conclusion. That is the very principle upon which we are proceeding; and that, I think, answers the objection that my hon. friend made in one part of his remarks.

Mr. OLIVER: What the minister has said in regard to grants to universities exactly bears out what I say: the practical result to be expected will be reached by the making of small grants to the universities. I am not suggesting that the minister should make grants to universities in respect of these particular questions, but if he feels the impulse to do something, let him make the grants to the universities directly for these purposes; let him not launch upon this country at this time an expensive organization which will cost $91,000 to start—no one knows how much it will cost to carry it on—when all that he proposes actually to spend in regard to the tar sand is $1,500. I presume a similar amount will be expended for research work in regard to the tar extract from the gas from burning straw, and possibly a similar amount as to the extract from coal gas. Those are moderate amounts, and I suppose nobody will object to their expenditure for such purposes. Let the minister make those expenditures if he pleases, and the country will support him, but let him not burden this country with an expenditure of $100,000 for the purpose of giving four or five thousand dollars for actual research work.

Mr. A. K. MACLEAN: The expenditure of $100,000 for scientific research in Canada is not objectionable, if we have the proper organization. It is quite possible, if real practical work is done by the commission, for an expenditure of $100,000 to yield a return of $1,000,000. I suppose one of the best instances of the value to a country of scientific work was that performed by the late Mr. Saunders in the Department of Agriculture. Mr. Saunders developed a seed wheat for Canada which matured some weeks earlier than any other wheat that had been known prior to this time in Canada.

Mr. SCHAFFNER: What wheat is that?

Mr. A. K. MACLEAN: I do not know what the name of the wheat is, but the fact which I have seen stated in government publications is that, through Mr. Saunders' effort, a special wheat was developed which matured very much earlier in Canada than any wheat previously known. I did not know that this fact was ever in question. I could easily put my hand upon written authority in which it is stated by very prominent persons that the result of this was the widening of the wheat belt in western Canada by many miles.

Mr. SCHAFFNER: I think the wheat to which the hon. member refers is Marquis wheat. The experience of practical farmers has been that it matures eight or ten days earlier than other kinds.

Mr. A. K. MACLEAN: The hon. gentleman may be correct, but I am simply stating to the committee a fact which I have seen stated a score of times. I am giving it to the committee just as I have gained it from my reading, and I have no doubt I am correct in this.

Mr. SCHAFFNER: I only wish the statement were true.

Mr. A. K. MACLEAN: It is well known that the work done by Mr. Saunders in this respect resulted in securing for Canada a seed wheat which enables us to harvest wheat very much earlier than we were able to do before, and that was a very important matter in a country in which the summer season is short. If what I have stated is correct, Mr. Saunders' work was worth millions of dollars to Canada.

When the Bill establishing this commission was before the committee, I objected to the personnel of the commission, and I want to repeat my objection. It is not satisfactory to the people of Canada; it is not satisfactory to some of the members of the commission. The men constituting that commission should be much younger men with some practical experience. I do not believe in establishing a commission composed of men who are able to give attention to this work for only a few days in a year. The appointment of such a commission is fraught with great possibilities for this country. The idea is absolutely sound. This is the time above all others in our history when we should be doing work of this kind. The very fact that we have a

tremendous debt to meet in consequence of the war is one reason why we should engage in this sort of work. My experience—and I am sure it is the case with other hon. gentlemen—is that I am frequently approached by men in my province who are confronted with some problem for the solution of which they desire scientific assistance. They cannot very well purchase this knowledge; they are not in a position to go abroad and bring into this country experts who would solve such problems, and this work should be done by the country, because it will aid in developing our commerce and our trade. Great care should be exercised in the selection of the board. I think a mistake has already been made; in fact, the whole board is a mistake. I do not wish to say anything more about it, because it is not pleasant discussing the personnel of a commission of this kind for, after all, the men on it are distinguished men and amongst our best citizens. But it is possibe to make a very grave mistake in judgment in selecting men for this work even if you do take them from amongst the most distinguished men of our universities. A great problem for a body of this kind would be in connection with soil fertilization. Nothing could be more important than that to this country. If this commission can ascertain some method of providing for the farmers of this country a fertilizer, in sufficient quantities and at a fair price, they will be doing something which will be worth millions of dollars to this country, and the expenditure of $100,000 would be a small matter in accomplishing such a result. What does the minister purpose doing in co-ordinating the work to be done by the commission and that which is now done by other departments? There are scientific men in the Department of Agriculture. There is a vote in the supplementary estimates of $6,000 for forestry studies. I do not know if it is advisable to make an expenditure for that purpose just at present. There are in the Department of Agriculture now some technical officials whose work is particularly along such lines.

Sir GEORGE FOSTER: Forestry lines?

Mr. A. K. MACLEAN: Yes.

Sir GEORGE FOSTER: That is in the Interior Department.

Mr. A. K. MACLEAN: In the Interior Department to some extent, and in the Department of Agriculture there is at least one gentleman whose work is along that line. In the Mines Branch there are quite a number of scientific men who devote their time to the scientific side of our mines and minerals, and you will probably find scientific men in other departments. Is the minister going to have them work together or separately? Could not their labours be co-ordinated? Possibly it might be advisable to take the scientific men from all the departments and put them into this branch.

Sir GEORGE FOSTER: That is exactly what is being very successfully done, and with the greatest good-will on the part of all the departments. They understand each other, and the council works with them and they work with the council. The idea is to co-ordinate and to bring, so to speak, into focus all those different agencies that have been doing excellent work, each by itself. My hon. friend is quite mistaken as to the number of men engaged in forestry work connected with the Department of Agriculture. They are in the Interior Department and in the Conservation Commission. They are working in strict conjunction, and the experiment, for which this vote is in the estimates to-day, is to be carried out by the experts in the Interior Department. It is not by any means a duplication of energy. The intention is to avoid that and to co-ordinate and concentrate the work upon the development of the resources of Canada.

Mr. SCHAFFNER: I understood my hon. friend from Halifax to say that some of these men are devoting only a portion of their time and energies to this work. If that is so, how many of the council are devoting their whole time and energies to the work? Some of them, surely.

Sir GEORGE FOSTER: The only one who is doing that is the administrative chairman. My hon. friend must remember that these gentlemen have been selected because of their eminence and practical knowledge in certain lines of investigation. It was never contemplated that they should themselves go into the laboratory and conduct experiments. They constitute a committee to set to work, and keep at work, and co-ordinate all the different agencies, and to apply whatever money we may appropriate for work along these lines. All of these men, with the exception of Dr. MacCallum, are giving their services free, but that does not mean that they are simply taking a holiday and taking no interest in the matter. These men have been at work now for more than a year, and I know what

they have done. They have devoted a very large portion of their busy lives to this work, and are thoroughly enthusiastic in seeing that it is brought to a successful issue— that it shall not be a mere fad, but give practical results which will be of very great benefit to the country. The council has met in Ottawa once or twice a month since it was appointed. They sit from three to five days; at one meeting here they sat a whole week. They are not treating this matter as a plaything or anything of that kind.

Their viewpoint was a very good one, and it entirely coincided with mine. A council of that kind, with that desire and that ability to work along these lines, cannot, if good results are to be obtained, all be working separately with no one responsible for the whole work. It was essential that one man should be appointed to co-ordinate their efforts, and the best man amongst them was chosen—he was their choice as well as mine—to act in that capacity, to direct, to consult, to keep the whole machine going, as it were, with these men as the motive power. But that is really the smallest thing that has been done. The advisory council has been at work a little over a year now, and in that time has brought together all the different forces in the Dominion that are engaged in industrial or scientific research, and which hitherto had been doing their work on their own, often duplicating each other, and lacking that energy and spirit that comes from co-ordination with other workers in the same line with a common object in view. The research branch of the Interior and Mining Departments, the Conservation Commission, the Inland Revenue and other research branches, have all been linked up with this general endeavour. In a little over a year all this dispersed effort has been concentrated, and has become inspired with a spirit and energy, and with a determined effort to work along these lines, that was foreign to them entirely a year ago. The council has put new spirit into them all.

I do not need to follow up what my hon. friend from Halifax said as to the immense necessity of this work, particularly at this time. A few thousand dollars is a mere bagatelle to the advantage that only one successful solution along some line might bring to the economic strength of this country. This work is almost an absolute necessity, if we are to keep abreast with other nations. My hon. friend says that this is not the commission we should have appointed. I would ask him to give the commission a free rein for a while, and after a year or so, I think he will come out of that contemplative area in which he has rested for about a year now, as respects undue criticism, and I think he will then revise his opinion of these men. Nobody can select members to suit everybody; we all have our opinions about them. But I am of the opinion that we have just about the very best council that could have been got together in the whole Dominion.

Mr. A. K. MACLEAN: Would it not be well to have some representative of agriculture on the council?

Sir GEORGE FOSTER: I suppose there is not a college or university in the whole Dominion which symbolizes agriculture so much as does the university of Saskatchewan, over which Dr. Murray presides. That is the foundation principle of his university, which was founded with a view to the agricultural possibilities and necessities of that great province.

Mr. A. K. MACLEAN: That hardly answers my question. I know Professor Murray very well. He has had very little to do with agriculture in a practical or scientific way in all his experience. He is a very busy man and is engaged in the building up of a new university in a new province. I am not objecting to him being a member of the board at all, because he is an excellent man indeed, one of the very best on the council. Still, I think it would be desirable to appoint another representative of agriculture to the board, with the qualifications I have indicated.

Mr. SINCLAIR: As these scientific men receive no salary, I can see no reason why the minister should not enlarge the council. It is a very big problem these men are undertaking, and there does not seem to be any reason why the number of members should be limited. There is a university in Nova Scotia, St. Francis Xavier, which has a number of eminent men on its staff who are devoting their time to scientific research, and I am sure some one among them could be found who would be of great value to the council if the minister should make up his mind to enlarge the number, I trust he will not fail to give this proposal his best consideration. I agree with my hon. friend from Halifax that youth counts for a great deal in work of this kind, especially for the chairman, and if the minister has put in charge of this work a man whose best days are over, and who has not the energy required for this work, I think he has made a mistake. I

do not know Professor MacCallum at all, but I have heard that remark made by men who are interested in the work of this council.

Sir GEORGE FOSTER: What does my hon. friend think is the age of Dr. MacCallum?

Mr. SINCLAIR: That is what I want to know.

Sir GEORGE FOSTER: You seem to have assumed that he is an old man. He is a comparatively young man.

Mr. PUGSLEY: What does "comparatively" mean?

Sir GEORGE FOSTER: He is somewhere around fifty-five or fifty-six. I do not consider a man old at that age.

Mr. GRAHAM: If that is so, he is almost too young.

Mr. SINCLAIR: The minister should be able to give exact information on that subject.

Sir GEORGE FOSTER: He may be older than that; I do not know.

Mr. SINCLAIR: The minister has not yet stated the salary to be paid.

Sir GEORGE FOSTER: $10,000 per year.

Mr. PUGSLEY: Not a bad salary.

Mr. ROSS: Every member of this committee will agree in the principle that it is a proper thing for the Government to pursue research on special problems. It may be very laudable and very profitable for the country to do so. But it may be questioned whether this is the proper time to establish a system of work of this kind, with our finances in the condition they now are and with pressing need for money for other purposes. I think the minister should not ask us to pass the various items included in this vote without giving more details. The first item is for $43,600 for salaries and expenses, including printing, stationery, etc. The minister has told us that the salary of the chairman is $10,000. He has told us, moreover, that none of the members except the chairman receive any salary. That still leaves $33,600, for salaries and expenses, to be accounted. This Government, since it came into power, has proceeded with almost a riotous abandon to create public officials, and it would look from this vote as though they were going to follow their own bad example. The minister owes it to the committee to inform it as to how the $33,600 is to be expended. What is the staff of this bureau to consist of? Do they have to pass the Civil Service Commission and be appointed by that body, or are they to be appointed by the Government of its own motion? The minister has said that Professor MacCallum's duty is to keep the whole machine going and that is the smallest part of the work, yet in addition to the salary of the chairman, there is this $33,000. The minister should give more detailed information as to how the money is to be spent.

Mr. NICKLE: It seems to me that the criticism which hon. gentlemen opposite are directing towards this vote is founded on a thorough misapprehension of Canada's requirements in the solution of the industrial problems that confront her. Prior to the outbreak of the war it was recognized that Germany and the United States were making more rapid advance industrially than any other nations in the world. Germany was making her advance because she had applied technical education to the education of her workmen, and had solved industrial problems by the application of chemistry and science. Some one has said that if Germany had been willing to stand by for another fifteen years she would have dominated the world industrially and economically and would never have had to fight this war. The United States was making the same advances in the industrial world that Germany was making, and the reason that these two nations were making such tremendous strides was that each had started much later in the industrial activities of the world than England. England had developed her industries along individualistic lines; they were not as all-embracing as those of Germany and the United States. The United States had taken advantage of the co-ordination of wealth and effort, and had developed tremendous industries. Germany had also attained the same thing with state aid, the result being that these two nations were enabled, through their mighty industries, to take advantage of the intelligence of the world and to apply chemistry and science to industrial problems. England, with her smaller industrial establishments, had been less progressive. We in Canada are just at the beginning of things. Gentlemen on the other side of the House have said that this is not the time to branch out along new lines of work, that we should wait until the war is over, that other things require the expenditure of that money more

than the solution of these industrial problems. It seems to me that these hon. members are entirely wrong, that there never was a time when it was so necessary for Canada to embark on this line of work as it is to-day. Some gentlemen have deprecated the application of science to industry. They must have closed their eyes to what has been going on in the world during the last twenty years. Look what the application of science is doing in this war for the lessening of sickness. It controls typhoid fever, a disease that, years ago, took two men out of every ten, because in the wars of the past disease took more soldiers than bullets. Look what science has done when applied to industry. We have cheap steel to-day. Why? Because Bessemer applied a process to steel that so cheapened the product that to-day it can be bought for one-half what it cost a few years ago. Take what has been done in recent years by the scientific application of electricity, by making use of our water-powers. To-day munitions are turned out in this country by the use of hardened steel tools in the lathes with a rapidity that a few years ago would have been impossible. We have the steel so tempered and hardened that it can be used in a rapidly moving lathe until the tool practically becomes red hot, so hot that, with the old process, it would have lost its point and edge. That is all possible owing to the application of science to industry. Then take the abrasives used in the manufacture of munitions and metal wares. Their production has become possible only through the application of science to industry. Then if Germany had not solved the problem and were not taking advantage also of Norway's development of electricity in taking the nitrates from the air, the munitions with which Germany is fighting to-day could not be made and peace with victory for the Allies would have come long ago. This line of thought brings another great problem to our attention. We have in this country great water-powers. We ought to do something to develop another great industry; we ought to take steps along a line of development that will make possible some economic method by which we can get nitrates from the atmosphere, and make a cheap fertilizer for our farmers. I believe that, in the United States to-day, they are spending some millions of dollars in an effort to solve that problem, yet we have done nothing. It seems to me that now is the accepted time and that we should begin. Reverting to what I said about our having small industries in Canada, and to the point that the great industries of Germany and the United States made possible the employment of the best men for the solution of their problems, let me direct attention to the fact that many of the best and brightest men who graduate from the universities of this country go to the United States because, when they have graduated from our colleges, there is no opportunity in Canada to secure adequate employment and reasonable remuneration, and if most of our industries have not attained a sufficient size and importance to warrant the expenditure to secure chemists of the highest class, is there any wiser thing for the Government to do than to take the matter in charge, to establish some central bureau or board that would keep in touch with the great problems touching this country's industrial life and the industry of the world, and keep in touch with the brightest minds of the universities, and give assistance to this university or to that, according as its men are working out the solution of one problem or another. I believe that if this scheme is properly managed, it will be of tremendous advantage to the country. I think it wiser that there should be a central board rather than that grants should be made to this university or that, because if you leave it to the universities—and I speak now as a university man—there will always be a tendency to spend the money on what you might call pure science rather than on the development of industrial science. If the money that is being expended here should result in the discovery of some process by which the nitrogen contained in the air or feldspar could be made available as a fertilizer, it would do more for this country than ten times or a hundred times the money contained in this vote.

I cannot speak with regard to the personnel of all of the commission. I do not know all the men who compose it. I have for years known Dr. MacCallum, a distinguished graduate and professor of Toronto University; I know Professor Kirkpatrick, professor of metallurgy in Queen's University. I know that he is a man of ability and energy, and that he represents the best thought in the faculty of science of Queen's University. He has applied his brains to the solution of practical problems, and what he has done has been for the advantage of this country. I desire to acknowledge the work that has been done by the young men of the universities. A few years ago an

amount of money was given by this Government to the School of Science at Kingston for the investigation of the cobalt problem, and to see if something could not be done with cobalt ore. Professor Kalmus and his assistants devoted attention to that question for three years, and discovered a process by which cobalt is used as a plating material. It is better and cheaper than silver, it does not tarnish, it lasts longer, stands harder service and wears better. I just quote this simple instance to show how the brains and energy that are to be found within our colleges can be profitably applied. I hope this committee will look with sympathy upon this vote, and that it will uphold the hands of the minister in trying to get this estimate through the House.

I hope the time is not very far distant when we will have a proposition before this House with reference to technical education. If we are going to develop our scientists in the application of science to industry, we should have technical education so that those who are to be the users of scientific methods may appreciate and make the best use of the scientific processes placed at their disposal.

Mr. SINCLAIR: What does the minister say to my proposal for the enlargement of his board so as to take in a representative of St. Francois Xavier College?

Sir GEORGE FOSTER: The principle which was decided upon at the first was that we should not make it representative of all the universities, because otherwise the number would be so great that it would be unworkable. Our people have to come from all parts of the Dominion. I think that I was perfectly right in getting a comparatively small committee. That does not, to a single hair's breadth, operate against the co-operation of every university, scientific institution or scientific person in Canada. It is the object of this council to organize all the talents and scientific knowledge by way of co-operating committees, and the council is at present developing its scheme in that respect. No person from Laval University down to the college of which my hon. friend speaks, or any other person who has abilities in that direction, will be left unsolicited. All others will be solicited and they will be joined into subsidiary committees working in connection with the central body. That is the line upon which Great Britain is proceeding. She has instituted, under her advisory council, committees in every portion of Great Britain, each for its special line. The idea is to call out from the country and use in this active co-ordinative work all the ability and talent we have.

5 p.m.

Mr. PUGSLEY: Over and above this advisory council of scientists, there is constituted, I see by the statute, a scientific research subcommittee which is charged with the appointment of this council. How is that subcommittee constituted?

Sir GEORGE FOSTER: It is composed of the Ministers of Mines, Interior, Agriculture, Labour, Inland Revenue and Trade and Commerce. With the exception of the Department of Labour, these departments have research branches.

Mr. ROSS: What staff has Dr. MacCallum surrounded himself with and which will be paid out of this amount of $43,600? How many are there and how are they appointed? Are they appointed by the Civil Service Commission, by the Government or by the doctor himself?

Sir GEORGE FOSTER: My hon. friend raises a question as to the machinery for carrying out the work and he seems to be seized with a very great fear that there will be some improper manipulation in reference to the help that these gentlemen require. I can assure my hon. friend that there is not the least danger of that. This is not a patronage department in any sense whatever. There will be no patronage in any way. If these gentlemen require to have a question put out in order to get information, we supply Dr. MacCallum with such help as he considers necessary and we apply to the Civil Service Commission for the purpose of getting the help to assist in that work. They are employed while they are able to do the work and no longer. At present there is a secretary without pay, there is a clerk, who has charge of the general department, under Dr. MacCallum, and there are temporary helpers to the extent probably of half a dozen who are engaged in the work in connection with these questionnaires. When they finish that work, if other work is necessary to be carried on, they will be at the disposal of the advisory council, as long as they are required but they will not be kept on a day if there is no work for them to do. I want to assure my hon. friend that it is not the intention with reference to this matter—as indeed it is not the practise with reference to my department—that there shall be any patronage. It is absolutely outside of patronage.

Mr. PUGSLEY: It must be a very important exception.

Sir GEORGE FOSTER: It must really surprise my hon. friend from St. John taking into account the way he used to carry on his department.

Mr. ROSS: I think the question is a very proper one. The minister seems not to have liked it very much.

Sir GEORGE FOSTER: The hon. gentleman is wrong in that; I want to give all the information.

Mr. ROSS: This is public money and I presume that any member has a perfect right to ask any question. As long as I am here I am going to do it. The minister's answer does not satisfy me. He still has $33,600 at his disposal after Dr. MacCallum has got his $10,000.

I think it is a very laudable and may be a very profitable scheme in any country, but I doubt whether this is the proper time to embark on such a work, in spite of what the hon. member for Kingston has said. The hon. minister tells us the council has a secretary who is not paid, and there are six or seven temporary employees, and that the expenses of this advisory council cannot be very heavy, because they do not meet often. The only other item of expenditure included in this vote is stationery, and yet he asks us for $33,600. I think he should give us more details, or cut down this item because that sum is not needed for the work he has mentioned.

Sir GEORGE FOSTER: I will give all the information I can, and the hon. gentleman must not think that I wish to refuse him any. I appreciate his evident anxiety for fear something will go wrong; I could not help but appreciate that anxiety. He said there was $33,600, made up of what items?

Mr. MURPHY: Deducting $10,000 salary from the first item of $43,600.

Sir GEORGE FOSTER: In the first place, these gentlemen who give their services, cannot be of essential service at all unless they meet together.

Mr. ROSS: Do they have regular meetings?

Sir GEORGE FOSTER: Yes.

Mr. ROSS: How often?

Sir GEORGE FOSTER: Once or twice a month. They have met regularly, not less than once a month and in some months twice. They come from Halifax in the east, and from points as far west as Saskatchewan. We pay their travelling and living expenses, and they hold about 20 meetings per year. These expenses form a part of the item. Whatever printing and stationery are necessary have to be provided for. If they require printing done, in order to help them out, it will have to be paid for. They will have to provide for distribution of information in different ways. These questionnaires, to which I have referred, deal with the chief work they are engaged in at the present time, and they involve an immense amount of tabulation. I will lay these questionnaires on the Table. When replies to all these questionnaires come in from industrial establishments, colleges, and scientific institutions, they will have to be collated, and the desired information tabulated. This vote will provide for that work. I am not prepared to say whether this $43,600 will be too much or too little. I have made a rough estimate for the first year, because it is experimental, but I can assure my hon. friend and the committee that nothing will be expended unless it is thought necessary, in the opinion of the advisory council.

Mr. CARROLL: I have been watching, with some interest, an attempt that has been made to grow trees on Sable Island, for the purpose of keeping the island from wearing away, and becoming more dangerous than it now is. Was that work started under the direction of this board?

Sir GEORGE FOSTER: That was commenced earlier.

Mr. CARROLL: With what success?

Sir GEORGE FOSTER: I have not followed it.

Mr. CARROLL: It might be interesting to direct the attention of the council to that question. The great difficulty is with the soil, which is sandy.

Mr. MARCIL: I did not hear the minister mention any special problem to be dealt with, except two in western Canada, one with regard to straw being converted into gas, and the other in connection with sand. Is there any problem to be solved in the other provinces?

Sir GEORGE FOSTER: The other provinces will not be left out. It is impossible for me to keep pace with all the deliberations of the board, so as to know exactly what they are doing. They are appointed for a certain purpose, and are supposed to be able to select the most important ques-

tions. I remember talking over one problem of great importance which is being considered at the present time, namely, the influence of fogs on sound. That is intimately connected with navigation. There are certain difficulties in respect to it, which, if overcome, will be of great benefit to navigators.

Mr. SINCLAIR: Might I suggest the importance of investigating certain practical questions connected with the fisheries, for example? We have some problems on the coast of the Maritime Provinces, in connection with the fisheries, which have never been solved, and I do not think any attempt has been made to solve them. For example, we are spending a large sum of money in hatcheries, and millions of lobster spawn are scattered on the face of the waters every year. Although we have been carrying on this propagation of lobsters for many years, no one can say, with authority, whether these lobsters live, develop and grow. It is a practical question and an expert should be able to solve it with a little consideration. There is another question with regard to the spawning place of the haddock and cod. Applications were made to prevent trawling in certain waters—the Gulf of St. Lawrence, for instance—and many fishermen had the idea that that was the spawning place of these fish, which, if so, would be a strong argument in favour of preventing trawlers operating in that locality during the spawning season. I mention this matter so that the minister can direct the attention of those investigators to these problems, which are of such vital importance to the fishing industry.

Mr. PUGSLEY: Does this board initiate the matters which are to be investigated, or will they investigate any subjects referred to them, either by the Government, or by individuals? I should like to know upon what line they proceed. We know there are many questions of practical interest which people would like to have investigated. The question asked by my hon. friend from Kingston, in regard to the production of nitrogen from feldspar is a very important matter, and the problem in connection with that has been very largely solved, but it might be taken hold of in a practical way.

So with regard to the obtaining of oil from shales, which are very numerous in this country; so with regard to obtaining by-products from bituminous coal. Will any person interested in work of this kind be encouraged to present his views to the board?

Sir GEORGE FOSTER: I am quite sure that one of the objects of the board's work will be to find out the problems that are troubling the industrial and productive interests of the country. The questionnaires which have been sent out broadcast have that purpose in view. They are to ascertain from these different industries and productive interests what their difficulties and problems are; these will be tabulated and work will be begun towards solution of the most important of them through these channels of investigation. Any such questions asked by individuals—not industrial establishments or corporations—will no doubt be taken into consideration by the advisory council. I may say to the member for Bonaventure (Mr. Marcil) that it escaped my recollection that Mr. Surveyer is a professor in Laval University.

Mr. OLIVER: I take the responsibility of suggesting, in view of the statements made by the minister and of the other information that we have had here to-day, that the organization which my hon. friend proposes will be a close corporation for the suppression of individual initiative in regard to scientific research.

Sir GEORGE FOSTER: I am willing to let it go at that, if my hon. friend is.

Mr. MURPHY: In times past considerable sums of money were voted for experiments in connection with the production of peat as a domestic fuel, and electric smelting as applied to the production of steel. I think this expenditure was made under the Department of the Interior.

Sir GEORGE FOSTER: The Mines Branch.

Mr. MURPHY: Is it proposed that these two matters will come under the jurisdiction and special charge of the industrial bureau which we have been discussing?

Sir GEORGE FOSTER: The Mines Department is co-ordinated with the advisory committee and they work together. One of the principal aims of the council is to co-ordinate all these different branches of industries. I do not know what practical results have come from these investigations. I think that they have succeeded in making a peat which is useful and has been used; how far it has gone towards being a commercial success I do not know. Probably a good deal more money will have to be spent

before the inquiry can be said to be an absolutely successful one.

Steam service between Prince Rupert and Queen Charlotte Islands—further amount required, $5,000.

Sir WILFRID LAURIER: Is that a weekly service?

Sir GEORGE FOSTER: It is a tri-weekly service. In order to have it carried on under present conditions, the Post Office Department and the Department of Trade and Commerce had to make a slight addition to the former subsidy.

Mr. OLIVER: How many vessels are employed in that service?

Sir GEORGE FOSTER: One, the Prince John—a very superior vessel.

Department of Finance and Treasury Board—To hereby promote H. Goode to Third Division, subdivision A, $100.

Mr. PUGSLEY: I do object to Parliament being asked by legislation to promote a man from one division to another. If this gentleman is entitled to promotion, he is entitled to it under the Civil Service Act. The House is asked "to hereby promote" this gentleman; what right have we to be asked to promote a man from one division to another? If he is entitled to promotion, let him have it, and let a salary be provided for it.

Sir THOMAS WHITE: My hon. friend uses language of hyperbole to describe what is really a very simple and proper transaction. My hon. friend is spending the powers of his intellect against a young woman, Miss Goode, who is to be promoted from one division to another, to take the position of Miss McConnell, resigned, who was paid $1,200 a year. She is employed in the office of the chief accountant. Miss Goode entered the service on July 1, 1915, and has passed the Civil Service examinations for stenographers. When she took over Miss McConnell's work it was found that the Civil Service Commission required her to pass in two or three extra subjects not covered in her stenographer's examinations before it would be possible to promote her to Third Division, subdivision A. She is one of the best clerks in the department, and we should have lost her services if we had not been able to promote her. This is not the best time to obtain skilled assistants of the kind in question; we are finding that out in the department. Generally speaking, I agree that it is not advisable in any way to transgress the provisions of the Civil Service Act; but I call my hon. friend's attention to item 410, in which the Civil Service Commission has been obliged to do this very thing themselves. Item 410 is to provide for the promotion of one clerk from Third Division, subdivision B, to Third Division, subdivision A, $112.50.

Mr. PUGSLEY: They have been encouraged by what the minister has done.

Sir THOMAS WHITE: So that if the Civil Service Commission, owing to a shortage of help in a time of war, have felt themselves justified in inserting an item of this kind, I do not think that my hon. friend ought to protest so strongly against our promoting this exceedingly efficient clerk to a position in which she will get $900 a year.

Department of Insurance—to provide for three clerkships in Third Division, Subdivision B: one at $800, one at $700, one at $600—$2,100.

Sir THOMAS WHITE: Several members of the actuarial staff of the department have enlisted. It is proposed to provide substitutes for those by making appointments in the lower divisions, which appointments it is necessary to create, the department having no vacancies in this division. Some of the younger men, who were very desirous of going to the front enlisted.

Mr. MURPHY: What has become of the positions which are vacated? Were salaries voted for them?

Sir THOMAS WHITE: The men who have enlisted receive their pay and their positions are being held for them, but as the department is handicapped by their absence, it is necessary to provide these substitutes by making appointments in the lower divisions, the idea being that, by the time those men come back, the work will have so increased that it will not be necessary to let any one go. The work of the Insurance Department is very efficiently done, and not with a large staff.

Department of Insurance — contingencies, printing, binding and stationery, including cost of annual reports, further amount required, $5,000.

Sir THOMAS WHITE: This amount is intended to cover the increased cost of printing and materials, and also to provide for an increased circulation. More and more of the reports issued by the Insurance Department are being asked for each year.

Pensions—compassionate allowance to Private Colin C. McNab for a disability arising from service during the Northwest Rebellion, 1885, $1,000.

Sir THOMAS WHITE: I am sorry the hon. member for South Renfrew (Mr. Graham) is not in his seat. This matter has been discussed at two previous sessions of Parliament. It has been brought to my attention by the Hon. Mr. Graham, by Dr. Maloney of South Renfrew and some others. Last year, in order that we might have an authentic report upon the case, and be informed as to its merits, I asked the Board of Pensions Commissioners to investigate the matter specially. They did so, and as a result they recommended to me that there was merit in the claim and that an allowance of $1,000 would, in their judgment, fairly meet the case. This item has been inserted accordingly.

Sir WILFRID LAURIER: Why was the claim refused before?

Sir THOMAS WHITE: This man, as I recollect the matter, was not a member of the force, but he had been specially requested to go along as an expert telegrapher. It is, of course, very necessary that telegraphers should accompany an expeditionary force. During his employment in that connection, by reason of exposure and the hardship of the campaign, his health was so affected that he subsequently became totally blind. There are two points: First, as to whether his blindness was directly related to his experience in the Northwest rebellion, and secondly, as to whether it would be proper, under any circumstances, to allow him a pension as he was not a member of the combatant force. It is open, of course, to Parliament to bring in a special item providing a pension for any person if the circumstances are such as to warrant it. This seems to be a case in which this man's service rendered to his country was a direct cause of his permanent disability through blindness. The Board of Pensions Commissioners have satisfied themselves that the blindness was so related to his experience, and it seems proper, under the circumstances, that Parliament should be generous to him.

Miscellaneous—Canadian Associated Press, $8,000.

Sir THOMAS WHITE: The explanation of the vote is: The Canadian Associated Press operates a cable service between Great Britain and Canada. This service was established in 1903, aided by a Dominion Government grant. J. Ross Robertson is president, and J. E. Atkinson, secretary-treasurer. A grant of $8,000 was made last year, when the association requested that such an amount be granted each year for five years—this being equivalent to the proportionate yearly value of the five years' subsidy ended June 30, 1915. For its last fiscal year, the cost of operating the association's cable services was $21,188, $13,188 being borne by the newspapers. Thirteen of the largest daily papers in eastern Canada take the direct service of the association, while in western Canada thirty papers get the cables through the Western Associated Press. Through regular news channels, the news so cabled is distributed indirectly to the daily and weekly press of the Dominion. During the past year, 208,000 words were cabled in addition to ordinary news of interest in connection with trade and financial matters, questions of interest to Canada and the Empire, etc. Since the war special attention has been paid to the activities of the Canadian forces in England, while a special correspondent pays a periodical visit to the front in France.

Miscellaneous—to provide for the administration of the Business Profits War Tax Act, 1916; appointments for the purpose may be made without reference to the provisions of the Civil Service Act, $150,000.

Sir THOMAS WHITE: A similar estimate was adopted by the House last year. It is, of course, only an estimate. The other day I brought down in the House an answer to a question in which I gave the information, if my recollection serves me aright, that the cost of administration for the portion of the year up to March 31 last during which the Act had been under administration, was something under $100,000. We think $150,000 will be an adequate estimate, and it is really a low percentage, having regard to the amount of taxation which we expect to collect from the Business Profits War Tax Act and its amendment this year. The staff was organized last year with representatives in every province, and in some provinces three or four representatives, with such clerical assistance as was necessary to carry out the work.

Sir WILFRID LAURIER: Do you propose to increase the staff?

Sir THOMAS WHITE: It will be the same staff. What I have in mind at present is to extend the business profits war tax staff in order that they may carry out also the administration of the income tax. It will undoubtedly be necessary to have a very large staff to carry out efficiently the income tax measure. It is the first work of that kind that has been done under Do-

minion administration, and every province will have to be covered, but we have a nucleus in the business profits war tax staff, and by expanding that I hope to cover the ground.

Mr. MURPHY: Why are you excluding the Civil Service Commission from making these appointments?

Sir THOMAS WHITE: It is not because I do not realize the utility of the Civil Service Commission, but I do not believe it would be possible to get qualified men who were capable of passing the Civil Service examination in time for the organization of a staff such as we have in mind. Take our experience last year. It was necessary to find men of business and accounting experience, and it is very difficult to get those men. We got men around 35, or 40, or 45 years of age, who had had banking or business experience, and after considerable trouble we managed to get together what I regard as a very creditable staff. I am quite satisfied, however, that few of them, if any, would be able to pass the Civil Service examination. The type of man you want is a man who knows business pretty well, and men pretty well, and has a certain force of character, but who probably would not be able to pass the academic examination which he might have been able to pass when he was sixteen years of age. My hon. friend from Russell could not begin to pass the Civil Service examination.

Mr. MURPHY: I would not attempt it.

Sir THOMAS WHITE: And as for the leader of the Opposition, he would be hopeless.

Mr. KYTE: Is it the intention of the minister to appoint members of the outside service in various parts of Canada to administer the Income Tax Act?

Sir THOMAS WHITE: I have not given the matter the attention it will receive before we can determine upon the organization. My own view is that if this Act is efficiently administered—and I do not want to administer it unless it is efficiently administered—we must have officials whose business it is to look after income assessments throughout this country. It has been suggested to me that we should use the provincial machinery. I doubt very much the advisability of that. The responsibility for the administration of this Act rests upon the Dominion Government, and I think it must be carried out through officials who are responsible to the Government for administering the Act. I do not think the work should be done by Customs or other officials throughout the country giving a small portion of their time to it. I would prefer to have each province organized with an efficient staff whose duties will be to see that assessable incomes in Canada are assessed, and that those who derive them will pay this taxation. If that is not done, I am satisfied that the income tax administration will be more or less a farce. In the cities of this country the municipal income tax is not administered as it should be. Of course, there are a great many exemptions which are not in our Act. Our Act calls for the assessment of the whole income of individuals no matter how derived, and so far as I can see, there are not many loopholes, if any, for escape. I am perfectly satisfied it would be a profound mistake to skimp it, by trying to get men who will give a little of their time to the work, and who would necessarily discharge their duties in a perfunctory fashion. The Act should be administered in a business-like way in order that those who are subject to this tax shall pay it. These are but general observations. I am sorry I am not able to answer my hon. friend more particularly, but he knows how busy I have been during the last two weeks in the House, and I have not yet turned my mind to the question of organization.

Mr. KYTE: If the minister will permit me to make a suggestion, I think he might with profit utilize the services of the municipal clerks and treasurers. In municipalities there are, in all probability, only a comparatively small number of men with incomes liable for assessment under this Act, and it would seem to me to be an unprofitable expenditure to appoint officials of this Government for the special purpose of collecting the income tax when there are not more than a dozen or two incomes to tax in a municipality. The municipal clerks and treasurers are familiar with the circumstances of all persons in the municipality; they are used to looking after the collection of taxes for municipal purposes, and it does seem to me that the collection of the income tax by this Government could be more efficiently done by municipal clerks and treasurers, particularly in the smaller municipalities in Nova Scotia. I would ask the minister to take this suggestion into consideration, and I think upon receiving more information he will conclude that I am right in saying that these men will be

the best persons to perform this work, being able to do it more efficiently and with less expense than officials specially appointed.

Sir THOMAS WHITE: I am much obliged for my hon. friend's suggestion, which I shall be glad to take into consideration. It was not in my mind, however, that the Government should appoint officials with limited districts, speaking geographically, to look after the administration of the Act. I should not like to appoint an official who had only a few assessments to make. But if we had an organization adequate to cover the province of Nova Scotia and other provinces, so that they would all be engaged all the time, I think there could be no objection to such a scheme, and if the information could be obtained, I think that would be the better way. But I am very glad indeed to have the suggestion of my hon. friend.

Mr. A. K. MACLEAN: When the minister organizes his staff for the collection of the income tax, I would suggest that he select men who will command the respect of the people, who will be looked upon as capable men anxious only to do their duty, and who will not be partisans in any way. The minister promised that the appointments in connection with the Business Profits War Tax Act would not be partisan appointments, and in the administration of an Act of this kind I think it is particularly desirable that officers should not be appointed merely by reason of political qualifications. They should be men who would be favourably regarded by the citizens generally regardless of political party. The suggestions of my hon. friend from Richmond might be valuable in a degree, but in a degree only. There are some counties where the municipal officers would not be competent—at least, that is my judgment. I think their general record as tax collectors is not a good one; their training has not been very good. While a municipal officer here and there might collect the income tax in his district very quickly and cheaply, I should not like to agree to that being done generally.

Sir THOMAS WHITE: I have made no appointments having regard to political considerations, as nothing could be more unfair than to have politics mixed up with the administration of a taxation Act. Before making an appointment in Halifax, I consulted a number of the leading business men of the city, and finally a very reputable man, who, I believe, is acceptable to the business community, was selected. I think the work there has been carried out quite satisfactorily. In New Brunswick we selected a man who had been for many years an assessor in St. John, and I believe that he has the esteem and confidence of the citizens. The chief collector in Montreal was an accountant who for many years was attached to the Department of Justice here, a very competent man. Similarly throughout the whole country the appointments have been made, and we have received extraordinarily few complaints with regard to the officers administering the Business Profits War Tax.

At six o'clock the committee took recess.

After Recess.

The committee resumed at eight o'clock, Mr. D. Stewart in the Chair.

LOAN OF $7,500,000 TO THE GRAND TRUNK PACIFIC.

Loan note exceeding $7,500,000, repayable on demand with interest payable half yearly at the rate of six per centum (6%); to be used to meet expenditure made or indebtedness incurred in paying interest on securities of the Grand Trunk Pacific Railway or the Grand Trunk Pacific Branch Lines Company; to meet deficit in operation of the Grand Trunk Pacific Railway system and for betterments and the purchase of rolling stock; said loan to be secured by mortgage upon the undertaking of the Grand Trunk Pacific Railway Company containing such terms and conditions as the Governor in Council may approve. The disposition of the loan to be subject to the direction of the Governor in Council. The company agree to constitute its board of directors as may be required from time to time by the Governor in Council.

Mr. OLIVER: Is the Minister of Finance (Sir Thomas White) in a position to give any information in regard to the total cost of raising the rails on the Grand Trunk Pacific west of Edmonton and generally in regard to the results to traffic and damages to property resulting from the raising of those rails?

Sir THOMAS WHITE: No; it did not occur to me that the question would arise in connection with this vote although I think it is proper for the hon. gentleman to raise it. The work of raising the rails is in progress but it is not yet finished. I am not in a position to make any statement as to the cost of replacement or the damages, if any, to which my hon. friend refers.

Mr. OLIVER: Would not the question of damages to the Grand Trunk Pacific have some bearing on this item? Would there not be a serious and important pay-

ment to the Grand Trunk Pacific because of the taking up of these rails? They surely are entitled to be paid for the rails and they are entitled to payment for the loss accruing. There should be some means of arriving at the cost.

Sir THOMAS WHITE: It does not occur to me that it will have any material bearing upon the amount of this estimate because the damages, if any, are quite indefinite and they may be set off for some advantage. It is obviously impossible to make a definite statement as to what the financial consequences would be of the transaction in question, and unless some definite information were had, which cannot well be had at this time, it does not occur to me that it will have a bearing on the question of the amount which Parliament should vote for the purpose of enabling the Grand Trunk Pacific to operate as a going concern during the next year.

Mr. OLIVER: I do not wish to discuss too intimately with the minister that point, but I would think it would have a very important bearing, first, upon the amount of money that would be at the disposal of the company during this current year, and, second, on their facilities for operation. On that point, I am in a position to inform the committee that the difference in the cost of operating is a matter of 250 tons per freight train; that is, the Grand Trunk Pacific can haul five cars of freight less with the road as it is now than it could haul with the road as it was. That is one item that is entitled to consideration. Generally speaking, the transaction is one of such a very remarkable character that I think the country is entitled to a great deal more definite information in regard to it than it has yet received. I cannot conceive of any occasion upon which it would be more appropriate to place that information before the House and the country than during the consideration of this item. Many hundreds of people have been put to great damage, inconvenience and loss, aside altogether from the railway company. Business enterprise in that locality has been seriously impeded. I am prepared to say that not a rail has gone forward to France that has been taken from that track and I am assured that not a rail will go forward to France, first because the shipping facilities are required for food and ammunition, and second, because the rails are not suitable or desired in France, they being very much heavier than are required.

Sir THOMAS WHITE: The information which I have is that 100 miles of rails have been taken from the Grand Trunk Pacific and that they are either in France or on the ocean and that in the east 30 miles have been taken west of Three Rivers. As to the rails taken up on the National Transcontinental railway, they are all in France. I may say to my hon. friend, that, while I know that this matter arises in his constituency, I have never been able to understand his attitude towards this taking up of rails. There is no one who is more loyal or has a better appreciation of this war and what it means than my hon. friend. I put to him the question: If an urgent request came from the British Government "We want rails and we want the Dominion Government to give them to us," would my hon. friend give them or would he not? That is the position with which we are confronted. Supposing that there is inconvenience, supposing that damage has resulted, does my hon. friend mean to say that this Government should hesitate to take up rails and send them over to France? I do not know whether my hon. friend has been at the front or not. I was at the front and I saw that if there was anything that was needed at the front last fall it was rails in order to get the guns up. What happened at Loos? What happened at other places? They might launch the fire of their artillery and destroy the trenches of the enemy but when they came to follow up they found that no headway could be made because the big guns could not be moved forward quickly enough to destroy the reserve trenches. The Germans might be driven off the first and second line trenches but it was absolutely necessary to move the guns up quickly and to do that they required heavy rails. Light rails were of no use for the purpose. They could bring up supplies of a certain character with light rails but to bring up the heavy guns they needed heavy rails. This is something that I will defend any place in Canada. It needs no defence. When we were informed that the British Government needed heavy rails we said that these rails should go forward and we proceeded to tear them up. The Minister of Railways said he would tear up half the rails in Canada to supply transport for the men at the front; so would I, and I would not hesitate about it. What does it matter about tearing up the rails, if it is going to save the lives of our noble soldiers. The boys at the front are being decimated; they are suffering great hardships, and dying, and, forsooth, because it is going to cause some inconvenience, it is said we should not forward the rails. I have not been able to understand my

hon. friend's position in this matter, because he is a loyal man, and has suffered much in this war. He knows the situation at the front, as well as any man in this House, and upon my word, I cannot understand the attitude he takes in regard to the matter of rails.

Mr. OLIVER: I am equally at a loss to understand the position my hon. friend the Minister of Finance and the Minister of Railways have taken. When this matter was up for consideration before, I raised the question as to why these rails were taken from Jasper pass, when rails could have been obtained much nearer the Atlantic coast, and I was told the reason they were taken from there was because they were of the same boring as the rails at the front. The minister made the statement that it was necessary to take the Grand Trunk Pacific rails instead of the Canadian Northern rails lying alongside of them, because there was a different boring for the bolts, which, by means of the fishplates, connected the ends of the rails. I say, on the information I have from France, and on the common sense that any ordinary man has, that the reason given is no reason at all. It is nothing more nor less than nonsense, and I think such an argument should not be advanced in the House of Commons by a responsible minister of the Crown. In the first place, these rails were taken from the Jasper pass, 2,500 miles from the Atlantic seaboard, when they had just as good a right to be taken, and could have been taken, from within 200 or 300 miles of the Atlantic seaboard. In the second place, they were taken from the Grand Trunk Pacific in the Jasper pass, when, alongside, was the Canadian Northern, with identically the same weight of rails, the same kind of rails, lying on a road not nearly as well graded as the Grand Trunk Pacific, and with steeper grades. They were taken off the Grand Trunk Pacific, instead of being taken off the Canadian Northern under the pretense—I say pretense—that, because there was half an inch difference in the location of the borings, therefore it was not convenient to use them in France. I say that, in view of such arguments being put before the House, supposedly by a serious Government, I am entitled to call in question the good faith of the Government in this matter, and to say that these rails were not taken up and sent to France because they were needed in France more than any other rail.

[Sir Thomas White.]

Sir THOMAS WHITE: Why were they taken up?

Mr. OLIVER: Because it was the policy of this Government to wreck the enterprise, and for no other reason. Has the Government ever laid on the table of the House the request of the British Government for these rails? No, they have not.

Mr. BRADBURY: Why should they be sent there, if they were not needed?

Mr. OLIVER: I am at a loss to understand why this Government does certain things. They have accounted for what they have done by talking nonsense.

Mr. BRADBURY: My hon. friend should not say it is nonsense.

Mr. OLIVER: I am saying it is nonsense, when they say that they had to take Grand Trunk rails, instead of Canadian Northern rails, because there was half an inch difference in the borings.

Mr. BRADBURY: That is an important thing.

Mr. OLIVER: I have information from the front that they link up all kinds of different rails.

Mr. GRAHAM: They do.

Mr. OLIVER: And so they can. My common sense tells me that for work at the front they do not want 80 pound steel, if they can get 60 pound, or lighter steel. Any man's common sense would tell him that, and when the Government undertakes to tell this House that they took up those rails because they had to, and because it was in the interest of the Allies fighting the battles in France, they are not doing justice to the intelligence of the House or of the country, and when I ask him what the cost is going to be—

Mr. HANNA: Does my hon. friend not know that the Railway Commission ordered those rails to be taken up at that particular place? The Railway Commission should know what is best to do in this matter.

Mr. OLIVER: I do not acknowledge allegiance to the Railway Commission. It is a creature of this Parliament—of this Government.

Mr. HANNA: They would be very much obliged to you for that statement.

Mr. OLIVER: I would be very glad to make that statement anywhere. This Parliament is not subject to the Railway Com-

mission; the Railway Commission should be subject to this Parliament. That commission has no authority from this Parliament to give its opinion as to where the rails should be taken up. They were taken up on the responsibility of the Government of this country.

Mr. HANNA: Does my hon. friend not think that the Railway Commission was a pretty fair authority to state where the rails should be taken up?

Mr. OLIVER: The advice of the Railway Commission is no doubt quite good in many respects.

Mr. HANNA: Absolutely.

Mr. OLIVER: But that commission was not appointed—and it is no part of their duty—to advise this Government as to where it should take up rails. The Railway Commission has certain important functions to perform, and I believe it performs those functions very well, but that is no reason why they should perform functions they never were appointed to perform, and which they are no better qualified to perform than my hon. friend or myself. If my hon. friend saw his constituents practically driven out of house and home by the action of this Government, and set afoot on the roadside, after they had spent most of their lives in a certain locality, he might take a different view of the matter.

Mr. HANNA: Not under the circumstances.

Mr. OLIVER: I think he would.

Mr. CARROLL: Did the hon. gentleman say the rails were not sent to France?

Mr. OLIVER: My information is that they have not been sent to France. The minister says they have been sent there, and I am bound to take his word. If they have been sent to France, I can only say that, if it is possible to transport 80 pound rails by the shipload across the Atlantic to France, there cannot surely be such trouble about getting food across the Atlantic as has been represented.

Mr. BRADBURY: It is just as important to have the rails as the guns.

Mr. OLIVER: It is important to have rails, but not as important to have those particular rails. There are other rails besides those in service through the Jasper Pass, and I say the false pretenses of the matter are that my hon. friend took the rails from the best graded road, and left them on the worst graded road, lying right alongside. What difference did it make to the British Government whether these rails be taken off the best graded road or off the poorest road, when they were the same kind of rails?

Mr. BRADBURY: There would be no difference, if th y were the same kind of rails.

Mr. OLIVER: They were the same kind of steel, and everything the same, except that the borings for the bolts which hold the fishplate were in a little different place. My hon. friend should know the boring for the fishplate is not an important mechanical performance, and, as a matter of fact, my information is that they link up all kinds of rails over there, and that they must do so, or they could never get along. The thing is too absurd for words, and when such a statement is made to this House in a serious way, I say it discredits the whole attitude of the Government in regard to the matter, and when I ask the ministers a plain simple question as to what this performance of theirs is costing either the country, the British Government or the Grand Trunk Pacific, they can tell me nothing about it. They say that it is a matter of no importance; I beg to assure them that it is a matter of very great importance. Is it not a matter of importance that men have been left stranded in the wilderness as these men have; that enterprises in the Jasper Park have been left practically in the air by the taking up of these rails? This Government has a right to consider the interests of the people. My hon. friend asks whether I am interested in the winning of the war. I think that I am in that just as much as he is.

Sir THOMAS WHITE: I admit that.

Mr. OLIVER: We are not arguing that point. Surely we have a right to hold the opinion that these rails could have been got nearer the Atlantic seaboard than the Jasper pass; that the rails that were taken were not rails the removal of which would do the least harm to the country or its work; that, the transport of food across the ocean being as important as it is, those rails could have been got in England or in France more conveniently than in Canada. Why does my hon. friend not lay on the table of the House the demand of the British Government for these rails? That has not yet been produced. I want to see that demand; I want to see if they asked for 80-pound rails off the Grand Trunk Pacific.

Mr. MORPHY: Has communication not been afforded in some other way in places where rails have been lifted?

Mr. OLIVER: So far as the Transcontinental traffic is concerned, yes. But I have already informed the committee that this was done at a cost of five cars of freight less each way. That is, by reason of the taking of Grand Trunk Pacific rails instead of Canadian Northern rails, trains will haul five cars of freight less each way. That is one result.

Mr. HANNA: Do they not haul all the freight they get?

Mr. OLIVER: Certainly, but the easier the grade, the more economically the freight is handled. After all, with a railroad as with everything else, it is a matter of profit on the work done. My hon. friend must realize that where men have settled down in the occupation of land, houses or property in a certain locality because the railroad is there, the pulling up of the rails wipes out the value of their time and investment. What is going to be done with regard to these people? Are they to be paid damages for the losses that they have suffered? If they are, who is going to pay those damages? Is the British Government to be wolfed because of this mismanagement and waste? Surely the British Government never bargained for any such transaction as that. I have letters from a school district asking what is to become of the school debentures raised in the town of Tollerton, a town that has gone out of existence because of the lifting of rails. These are matters that the Government of Canada must seriously consider. Remember that we are here for the Government of Canada, not for the Government of France or the Government of Britain.

Sir THOMAS WHITE: I beg my hon. friend's pardon; we are here for the Government of Canada, but we are here also for the British Empire and trying to win this war. My hon. friend puts forth the argument that this Government, in taking up the rails on the National Transcontinental and the Grand Trunk Pacific, was actuated by a desire to ruin the Grand Trunk Pacific rather than a desire to get forward the rails required by the British Government. Does he suppose that any man in this committee who has a remnant of reason left will accept that argument? Does he think that the people of the country will accept it for a moment? My hon. friend says that without any request from the British Government, simply in order to destroy the Grand Trunk Pacific, the enterprise of the late Government, we took up these rails and sent them to France. Does my hon. friend think that he is addressing himself to men devoid of reason—because that is what his argument implies. The British Government needed rails to get up the heavy guns. They wanted 80-lb. rails, and they so specified. We sent them 80-lb. rails; in order not to embarrass railways in Canada other than Government railways, we took them in the first instance from the National Transcontinental railway. When we had sent them that kind of rail they wanted us to send the same kind in the further quantities that they were anxious to secure. We then asked Sir Henry Drayton, chairman of the Board of Railway Commissioners of Canada, to advise us where in Canada that particular kind of rail could be taken up with the least public inconvenience. What else could the Government do? How could the Government have acted more fairly? To what other tribunal should we have applied? The Board of Railway Commissioners is a non-partisan tribunal, responsible not to the Dominion Government, but to this Parliament. On their advice these rails were taken upon the Grand Trunk Pacific. My hon. friend knows that the Grand Trunk Pacific and the Canadian Northern lines parallel each other in this particular district of which he is speaking; he knows that a composite road was made there. We made the best of the situation in order that we might send forward these rails which were so urgently required and at the same time have due regard to the public interest. My hon. friend speaks of the practicability of joining 60-lb. and 80-lb. rails, or 80-lb. and 40-lb. rails in France. That could be done near the seaboard by the use of hand forged fish plates; there is plenty of time; there is no such inconvenience as there is nearer the front. But when the men have to work under fire, the authorities want rails that can be joined by standard fish plates. That is the reason why, having got 300 miles of rails from the National Transcontinental, they wanted other rails from the Grand Trunk Pacific, of the same weight and the same borings, in order that standard fish plates might be used near the front, where the men work under the greatest possible inconvenience and danger. There it is necessary that these rails should be joined up quickly in order that the great guns may be sent to the front to follow up any advance movement that may be made.

My hon. friend's attitude in this matter is the most extraordinary that I have ever seen taken by any man in this House. He solemnly gets up and puts forward the suggestion that we have not sent these rails over to assist the men at the front, or in response to the urgent request of the British Government instigated by an urgent demand on the part of the commander in chief at the front. He says: that is not what you were doing; your sole object was to destroy the Grand Trunk Pacific; you have acted like a lot of mad men in tearing up rails that were not wanted at the front. Without exception, that is the most preposterous statement I have ever heard made in this House. My hon. friend says: that we took up the rails from the Grand Trunk Pacific, and that means that we took away a part of the railway itself which is covered by mortgage in favour of its bondholders, and is a part of the capital investment of the company. I said that this matter had not any bearing upon the item under consideration; I still say that, because the replacement of rails means the replacement of capital. In this estimate we are dealing not with capital, but with the question of deficit on operations and interest upon underlying securities. This estimate is to furnish the Grand Trunk Pacific with $7,500,000, in order, first, to meet the deficit on operation, and, second, to meet the fixed charges for the year. Whatever sum is given the Grand Trunk Pacific in respect of rails taken up will simply be replacement of capital to that extent. As to claims for damages on the part of those who may hold that they have been inconvenienced or damaged by the taking up of the rails, that is a matter for consideration.

I cannot say offhand here to-night how much money is involved one way or the other. In estimating what damage, if any, has been sustained by the Grand Trunk Pacific, there would have to be a consideration as to the value of the rails and the replacement, and, on the other hand, any advantage the railway company might gain as against the disadvantages of which my hon. friend has spoken. I have not passed an opinion upon the matter, and it is not possible for any one to do so offhand. My hon. friend has gone beyond himself in conjuring up fantastic reasons for the action of the Government, which was taken at the urgent request of the British Government in order to meet a very pressing need at the front. He says that we have not placed the papers upon the table. In connection with the war, there are hundreds of papers which we cannot place upon the table of this House, which are of the most secret and confidential character, involving wants and needs of the Imperial Government, disclosing a situation of which they are willing to make this Government aware, but which they would not like to be published to the world. My hon. friend surely would not ask that there should be laid upon the table secret documents that might give to the enemy information of a kind that would be of value to him. My hon. friend, I am sure, would be the last man to suggest that. I cannot help thinking that my hon. friend has been carried away by his partisanship in this matter to such an extent that he feels justified in making these wholly fallacious charges against the Government, which is acting in the utmost good faith in this transaction.

Mr. OLIVER: If the Government has acted in good faith its arguments do not lead one to that conclusion. This vote is for an advance to the Grand Trunk Pacific railroad, taking security upon the property of that road. The advance of last year was the same. Surely the security is deteriorated by the removal of the rails on 130 miles of the road.

Sir THOMAS WHITE: Not if they are replaced and the damage repaired.

Mr. COCHRANE: They have been replaced.

Mr. OLIVER: I am afraid my hon. friend is not well informed.

Mr. COCHRANE: I know I am right.

Mr. OLIVER: I would say, if I would not be out of order, that I know my hon. friend is not right, because, as a matter of fact, the rails on the Grand Trunk Pacific have been partially, but not altogether, replaced. My information is that the difference between the haulage possibilities of the Grand Trunk to-day and what it was before it was deprived of those rails is five cars per train.

Mr. COCHRANE: That is not true.

Mr. OLIVER: Very well, that will have to rest. My hon. friend and I cannot arrange that now. My statement will have to stand as a statement of fact for the present.

Mr. COCHRANE: It is a statement of yours, not of fact.

Mr. OLIVER: That is quite satisfactory to me. It is very conclusive on the point.

Of all the arguments that have been put forward on behalf of this very remarkable transaction, the most absurd is that which has just been put forward by the Minister of Finance as the reason why the documents have not been laid upon the Table, namely, because of the special request of the British Government, because of their secret character, because they might give information of value to the enemy. I appeal to the committee if that is not more absurd—if I am not out of order in using the word—than the assertion that it was necessary to take the Grand Trunk Pacific rails because the Transcontinental rails had already been taken. It is not good enough for this Government, charged with the responsibility of governing the people of this country and protecting their interests, to shelter themselves, first behind the British Government, and secondly behind the Railway Commission. There is no power nor authority that this Government is entitled to shelter itself behind in regard to matters of administration touching the affairs of the people of Canada. Let there be no mistake on that point. When people are dispossessed of their property, as they have been in my constituency—

Mr. BRADBURY: How many of the hon. member's constituents are affected?

Mr. OLIVER: I could not say how many, but it does not make any difference if there is only one. His rights are just as sacred as the rights of any other man in any other part of this country, as the rights of any corporation or company in this country. Those people have a right to be protected, and if they have not been protected, if their rights have been thrown aside by the lifting of the rails, then they are entitled to compensation without undue delay. The Government, having made up its mind to do as it has done, having the reasons it says it has for its action, has a right to deal promptly and effectively with the people whom it has dispossessed of the value of their property. The enthusiasm of the Minister of Finance for the winning of the war by tearing up the rails out in the Jasper pass reminds me very much of the late Artemus Ward, who, at the time of the American Civil War, declared that he was for the winning of the war even if it cost him all his wife's relations. The minister was willing to tear up the rails out in Jasper pass. There are, however, rails very much nearer the Atlantic coast than the Jasper pass is. Why did he not tear up a few of them? There are rails between the good city of Toronto and the town of Sudbury where there are two parallel tracks. Those rails are much nearer the Atlantic coast than is the Jasper pass, but the minister did not touch a rail there. There are three railway lines between Ottawa and the city of Toronto, but none of those rails were raised. I would like to see a little even-handed justice in this matter. If the needs of the war demand that rails shall be taken, why certainly let them be taken, but I do not see why they should all be taken from my constituency to the loss and damage of my constituents, when other people in other parts of the country are left free of any damage, while they shout their patriotism to the four winds of heaven. They can afford to be patriotic if it does not cost them anything, or when it costs only the people out in the prairie West something. That sort of patriotism does not appeal to me, and it certainly will never prevent me from standing up for the interest of my constituents in this House as long as I have a seat in it. I am willing to stand by the war, by the country, and by patriotism, but I want some of the other men who are doing so much shouting to do a little of the sacrificing also.

Sir THOMAS WHITE: In order that the committee may have further information as to this matter, I read this extract from the Order in Council which has been laid on the table of the House:

> Further, the minister has had the question of this further trackage required referred to Sir Henry Drayton, Chief Commissioner of the Board of Railway Commissioners for Canada, and he is in receipt of a communication from Sir Henry recommending that a further 300 miles of rails be obtained from the Grand Trunk Pacific Railway, partly from that portion of their lines running through the Yellowhead Pass which closely parallels the Canadian Northern, and partly from some of the main line track at other points. The latter to be replaced by other rails.

Then the minister proceeds with his recommendation. There has also been placed on the table of the House a letter from the Comptroller of Railways enclosing a report from A. C. Henry of the engineering staff, covering his investigation in connection with the taking up of the rails of the Grand Trunk Pacific railway through the Yellowhead pass, in which the comptroller says:

> The plan proposed permits of the salving of all the Grand Trunk Pacific rails through the construction of a composite line, made up from the roadbed of the Canadian Northern Railway for 128 miles, and the balance from the Grand Trunk Pacific roadbed, for 77 miles.

After referring to the details of the composite line as shown on the sketch plan at-

tached to the report, which is dated June 12, 1917, he says:

> The only disturbance to settlers of any moment is on that part of the Canadian Northern line between Ansell and Leaman, and the reasons for this and the proposed method of dealing with the settlers, is fully set out in Mr. Henry's report.
>
> The work of track lifting is proceeding with the utmost despatch. All section men on both lines and all local labour available, are being utilized, and in addition, we have 150 soldiers from construction battalions, detailed by the Department of Militia and Defence, who arrived at Jasper on the 4th instant.
>
> The first of the rails will be in transit to Three Rivers this week, and unless some unforeseen contingency arises to retard the work, we hope to have all rails in transit by the end of July.

My hon. friend has made the statement that these rails are not in France nor on their way to France. The Comptroller of Railways says he has reports every day as to the position of these rails in their movement towards the front. The statement I have made is absolutely correct. Mr. Henry, the assistant engineer, says in his report:

> In my view the general allocation of the composite line, having regard to the fact that rails of Grand Trunk Pacific type are required for shipment overseas, is the only feasible one. Under the proposed arrangement, all the coal mines in operation along both lines are served and the least possible disturbance and inconvenience caused to the settlers tributary to both lines. In addition, there can be no doubt that the single composite line proposed, if properly operated, will be able to handle the traffic of both lines on this section for many years, at a much lower operating expenditure than would be involved in the maintenance and operation of both lines between these points.

These documents are of record, having been laid on the Table. I have no manner of objection to my hon. friend getting up and talking in favour of his constituents; that is an almost universal practice in this House. But I do object to his putting forward in this House the assertion that this Government tore up the rails on the Grand Trunk Pacific, not for the purpose of meeting the request of the British Government or of assisting military operations at the front, but solely with the idea of destroying the Grand Trunk Railway system, which was brought into existence under the late Government.

Mr. GRAHAM: I fully agree with the hon. member for Edmonton in saying that the reason given as to the fish plates and the borings is not very strong. The fish plates would have gone with the rails that went over; the readjusting of two joints is the only change that would have had to be made. All the switches and branch lines at the front are not of the heavy weight rail. Any man who has studied railway construction at all knows it is perfectly laughable to make such a fuss about fish plates.

I see in the Grand Trunk Pacific statement that of this $7,494,760.78 only about $2,500,000 is guaranteed by the Dominion Government. I think it is only fair the committee should understand that the amount of money that is being granted to pay the interest of the Grand Trunk Pacific is not all on account of bonds guaranteed by the Dominion Government. Out of the total amount of $7,494,760.78 only about $2,500,000 is under Dominion guarantee.

If I am not mistaken, of this $2,500,000, $1,655,000 is payable on the contract by the Dominion Government on the mountain section seven years from the 1st of January, 1916. So if we deduct that $1,655,000 from the $2,500,000, we would have less than $1,000,000 guaranteed by the federal authorities. The balance of this amount is made up of guarantees from the provinces of Alberta and Saskatchewan.

I notice, too, that there is an estimated operating loss on the steamship company of $100,000. It had slipped my mind that the steamship company was in this transaction, but it appears that the Grand Trunk Pacific Steamship Company running from Vancouver to Prince Rupert is a part of this agreement, and we have here an amount to assist in making up the operating loss on this line of steamers.

Then there is another very interesting item here—not providing, of course, for interest—namely, that the Grand Trunk Pacific with its branch lines has an operating surplus of $1,100,000. I do not want to make any very lengthy remarks to-night, because I think we discussed this question at great length in connection with the Canadian Northern Railway system, but the entire railway situation in Canada, particularly in the West, is so bound up that that could not be avoided. The Grand Trunk Pacific, however, in its present condition can never hope to be made a paying institution, for it is obvious that the object in view in the construction of the Grand Trunk Pacific line has not been carried out. I frankly admit that it was a matter of frequent contention between the late Mr. Hays, president of the Grand Trunk Pacific, and myself, that it did not construct a sufficient number of branch lines as it went along with their main line. Great hopes were entertained of a steamship line between Prince Rupert and the Orient, but those hopes have not materialized, and the

Grand Trunk Pacific system will never be made the great success it was intended to be until that steamship connection is made. I do not wish to detract from the merits of any harbour, but I think there is no better harbour in the world than Prince Rupert, and the optimism of the Grand Trunk Pacific people and the Grand Trunk as well as of the Government was bound up largely in connection with the Orient, from where it was hoped to get through traffic for the Grand Trunk Pacific via Prince Rupert. But so long as we have not got that line of steamships to connect up the Orient with the Grand Trunk Pacific, so long will the Grand Trunk Pacific be merely a local line. At the present time it runs from Winnipeg to Prince Rupert, with no connection of its own at either end. The whole line from Winnipeg east belongs to the Transcontinental.

The haul from Winnipeg east belongs to the Transcontinental, and even the Grand Trunk Pacific has no way of getting to the lakes now over its own connections. It is shut off absolutely at Winnipeg. I have great faith, though, in the future of this line of railway. The Government has handed over to the Senate a Bill providing for the taking over of the Canadian Northern railway and will be in a position, perhaps, to discuss the question of branch lines in a more favourable way than heretofore. There are two or three things needed to make this enterprise a success. In the first place, I believe that steamship connection with the East is absolutely necessary, because one of the great objects of the line will be unattainable if we do not have that steamship line. In the second place, I am inclined to think provision must be made for the construction of a greater number of branch lines, particularly in the prairie country and perhaps in some of the valleys of the mountains. As to the Grand Trunk Pacific running a line to Vancouver, there is now a line projected and partially constructed over which there has been a great deal of difficulty, and I would not dare discuss that. But with the Canadian Northern railway in the position it will be now, in the hands of the Government, perhaps some of this difficulty might be obviated. The great object of the Grand Trunk Pacific was to get a through line via Prince Rupert to the Orient. A question was raised by the Prime Minister the other night about the co-operative administration of roads. If he meant that all the lines are to be under one ownership, it would be a big question to discuss. My own view is that there are a thousand and one things to be considered in addition to rates, and that without competition you would lose a great deal of the benefit, or rather you would fail to derive benefit that you would have with competition. Take, for example, car distribution. While we have an Act dealing with this subject and many regulations covering it, the fact remains that laws and regulations do not operate as advantageously as competition. A shipper between here and Toronto informed me that now that he has three lines of railway passing his town he has no difficulty in getting a car at any time. His shipping with competition is much more advantageous than with one line. The Board of Railway Commissioners would say: You must have a car at a certain time and the rate must be fixed at a certain amount, but the little details that competition brings do not come to the users of a line without competition. I believe that some method could be devised by which we could arrange for the use of lines by roads other than the owners of those lines in a better way than we have been able to do heretofore. The Canadian Pacific Railway is very much crowded in certain parts of the West, and has been discussing double tracking a large mileage. It has already expended many millions of dollars for this purpose. I see no reason why provision could not be made to relieve the congestion on any one line by operating part of its traffic over another parallel line on which the traffic was not so heavy, so that the business of the people would not be retarded, because the people of the country have built these roads to a very large extent. The Prime Minister spoke about co-operative management. I think it would not need co-operative management exactly, but certain terms could be laid down under which one road would use the rails of another and a car could be handed over by one company to another on definite terms laid down by the commissioner. In this way two parallel roads could be used as a double track system with great benefit to the people.

9 p.m.

As to the future, I have confidence that the railway mileage of Canada is not too great. It may be too great for the production of Canada at the present time, but not for the productiveness of Canada, and it will be for the people and Parliament of Canada to see that, when the war is over, we have the people to develop all our western country; and this railway mileage will

not be excessive for the productiveness of our country when we have people on the land, for with the productiveness of the land will come the productiveness of all our industries, because, after all, our future is bound up not in any one thing but in many things. I received information to-day about a mining proposition that seems to have very great prospects. I was asked if it would be possible to get the Government to build a branch line to a certain mining development. My advice was that the Government would probably be from Missouri just now and would have to be shown before extending mileage, but if in any part of Canada there was a development for the good of Canada, Parliament would be ready to vote money for any reasonable proposition of that kind if it were a paying one.

So far as the Dominion is concerned, we are not paying this money so much for securities guaranteed by the Government as to aid the projects of other guarantors of the securities, and in this connection I may be pardoned for saying that I have always had a rather kindly feeling for the old Grand Trunk as one of the pioneer railways of Canada. The Grand Trunk is committed to the Grand Trunk Pacific very heavily in guarantees, and I believe that the Government at the present time could not do else but take such step as this unless we are going to embarrass the Grand Trunk and place it in a position which I still maintain we should not allow our roads to get into at the present time, as our own credit is bound up with theirs to a larger degree than some people seem to realize or admit. While I realize the financial situation, I am not pessimistic at all as to the future of Canada and its railway projects. I believe that in years to come, when the great development of our country is to take place after the war and we have to face all these situations, the people of Canada will be capable of facing all these difficulties. We all believe that the resourcefulness of Canada is equal to any demands that may be made upon her.

It will not be long, I hope, before peace will come and we will have an opportunity of arranging our financial affairs so that we can proceed with the development of the country, which for the time being has been retarded, but which has only been checked and not stopped. The way in which they have acquitted themselves has shown the people of the world that the men produced on this half of the North American continent are worthy of their sires, and what they have accomplished and will still accomplish in their fight for freedom is indicative of what they can do when peace comes in the development of their own country.

Item passed.

To increase the pension of Mrs. Margaret Johnson Brooke from $1.25 to $1.75 per diem, further amount required, $182.50.

Sir THOMAS WHITE: I will read the following explanation, which is signed by the Prime Minister:

Mrs. Margaret Johnson Brooke is the widow of the late Staff-Sergeant Brooke who was drowned while on duty in 1903. She was granted a pension of 75 cents per diem, representing one half of the pay of her deceased husband—

Mr. GRAHAM: Carried.

National Gallery of Canada—further amount required, $10,000.

Sir THOMAS WHITE: Our policy has been to cut down these grants as much as possible since the outbreak of the war. At the first revision of the estimates, after the war broke out, this grant was cut down from $100,000 to $25,000. In the main estimates of this year the grant of $25,000 for 1917 was cut down to $8,000. In view of the fact that this amount is adequate only for salaries and expenses, leaving nothing to purchase the works of Canadian artists, this $10,000 is being provided for that purpose. The war has been very hard indeed upon Canadian artists, some of whom are engaged in painting for the National Gallery. The cutting down has been very substantial, from $100,000 to the present amount, and I hope the committee will take a fair view of this and grant this further sum, having regard to the important work of some very worthy Canadian artists.

Mr. MORPHY: What kind of paintings are the Canadian artists engaged upon? It seems to me that if they are engaged upon ordinary everyday paintings, the country's money might better be spent in attempting to have these artists put on canvas something that would perpetuate the valour of the Canadian soldiers who are fighting at the front. I fancy the battle of St. Julien, or the second battle of Ypres or the battle of Langemarck would be very good subjects. Some such pictures as these would be desirable acquisitions for the National Gallery. But, if they are going to paint orchards, flower beds and rivers I would oppose the vote.

Mr. OLIVER: What artists painted the war or military scenes that are on view

in the gallery on the fourth floor of this building?

Sir THOMAS WHITE: I think it was Homer Watson.

Mr. OLIVER: Is he still at large?

Sir THOMAS WHITE: As to these particular paintings, to which my hon. friend refers, I will not give any opinion to the committee but I would say that Mr. Homer Watson is one of our most distinguished artists. My hon. friend from North Perth (Mr. Morphy) suggested that some of our artists might be engaged in painting battle scenes. If you take a man out of his particular sphere he is apt to accomplish the opposite to an artistic result. I do not know whether we have any artists in Canada who are capable of painting battle scenes but we have some very deserving artists and I think that even at a time like this we should not overlook those members of the community, who mean a great deal to the country from the aesthetic point of view, who have to make their living like the rest of us and whose numbers I should personally like to see increased rather than diminished as the nation goes forward. We must not think, although we are sometimes prone to do it, that the only votes which should go through are those for dredging or public works. If we are to be what we expect to be we must keep the light burning in the realms of literature, art and science.

Mr. GRAHAM: Does the minister think that at this time it would be inflicting any great hardship on our artists if we did not have this vote? We are all more or less affected with financial stringency and we have been willing parties to asking any person who makes an income to contribute a good deal of it towards carrying on the war. Under those conditions, does the minister think that the people who want to be taxed to carry on a war would be willing to undergo the same operation even to encourage art at this particular time? The encouragement of art at the proper time, of course, is very laudable. At this particular time we are being asked to restrict our appetites, to control our food consumption and to contribute of any little means we may have in order that the financial condition in Canada may be kept equal to the demands upon it. In addition to that we are asked to send away our sons to fight an enemy who is a real enemy. Under these conditions does the minister think we ought to expend money for this purpose, no matter how laudable it would be under ordinary circumstances?

Sir THOMAS WHITE: I was influenced by the same view that has moved my hon. friend to express himself as he has. I think his criticism would be amply justified if we had maintained the original vote. This country has been in the habit of voting $100,000 a year to encourage Canadian art. This is not for the purpose solely of giving Canadian artists work. This National gallery lends pictures to all the cities throughout Canada, especially, I understand, in the West, so that the work is really a national work. The vote for the year preceding the war was $100,000, last year it was cut down to $25,000, and this year the amount placed in the estimates was $8,000, but it was thought it would have a serious effect on the artists and sculptors, and it was decided to place an additional $10,000 in the estimates, which will make the total vote this year $18,000. I do not like to ask Parliament to spend money for anything other than practical purposes, especially during the war, but I feel a certain kindness towards men engaged in art and science. They do more for the nation than we realize, and I think we should be generous, rather than otherwise, with them. This is not a large amount. It is the amount barely necessary to take care of commissions which have already been given, and it will not have any appreciable effect on military efforts during the war. The money is paid out to artists. Some meritorious cases have been brought to my attention since the war broke out. We have some notable sculptors in this country, men who have brought credit to Canada by their work. Some of them have devoted their lives to the profession, and the war has caused a stoppage of orders. We have been gradually slowing down in the matter of this vote, but we think we have given fair consideration to these artists and sculptors.

Mr. MORPHY: It is quite true that the amount is insignificant, and hardly worth while talking about, but there seems to be a principle underlying it, and if the minister by governmental action is going to take care of all the individuals in Canada who have suffered by the war he will require a large appropriation. Our pension bill is going to be very heavy, and there is a continuous cry—and I think a proper cry—that more should be done for the returned soldier, for those who are entitled to pensions, for everybody who has suffered through the war. I wish to refer to a case

in my own constituency, and I am sorry the hon. member for St. Antoine (Sir Herbert Ames), who is head of the Patriotic Fund is not here. I refer to the case of a woman whose husband was killed or disabled at the front. She did not apply for separation allowance until just lately, and the Patriotic Fund authorities of the province refused to give her any separation allowance, because she did not apply in time, and they claim they are hard up for money. Every fund that is being distributed for the benefit of the soldiers is short of money at the present time. The principle I object to in this item is the specific favour to some people who cannot show that they deserve anything at the hands of the country, except for a sentimental reason. Are these artists fighting at the front? Are they of the proper age to go and fight? Who are they? I can conceive that there are some young budding artists who have gone to the front and are fighting, and I would not object to paying those men. The Kaiser sent artists to the battlefields to portray the valour of his troops. But when a widow is refused separation allowance from the Patriotic Fund, because, forsooth, she did not apply in time, it is coming to a pretty pass. She could not even get the back pay of her husband. I do not believe we should be extravagant in our allowances, unless it is advisable in the national interest. These artists are doing good work in the development of art, and elevating the public mind to a higher plane, but just now I would say that we should not vote this money.

Mr. PARDEE: I desire to endorse the sentiments of my hon. friend from North Perth (Mr. Morphy). Not long ago we had the argument that, if the income tax were passed, the rich man would not give to the Patriotic Fund. I have one case in mind in regard to which I had correspondence with the authorities in regard to a separation allowance. The authorities did not know that they could make the allowance, and so forth. It appears to me that, as far as it is possible, the Government should just pare down to the very bones the financial necessities of this country. I have some regard for artists and sculptors and so on, but when we get down to the real necessities, why should artists and sculptors have to be taken care of more than men who, by reason of the war perhaps, have suffered just as much as they have? These men have as much right to be considered, but not on the lines of aestheticism, as suggested by the Minister of Finance. Why should the artist be taken care of any more than other men who have suffered? We know that there are thousands of cases of men and women, who, by reason of this war, have been deprived of a livelihood. and many women have not only been deprived of a livelihood, but have suffered a great hardship by the loss of relatives and helpmeets. After all, when we go out and talk to the people and say, "Now, we must have thrift here, and production there, the country is in this state, and in that state, and the very worst is liable to happen to us," I do not know why the artists should get a grant of $18,000 out of the hard earned money of the people. These times, when we are talking of hundreds of millions of dollars $18,000 may not look large, but every little helps, and, so far as I am concerned, I cannot see that this vote is necessary. These men have taken up this line; perhaps I am not inclined to regard it as poetically as the Minister of Finance, but the artists and sculptors have chosen their profession the same as you or I chose our professions, whether it be law or medicine or anything else. If these artists are deprived of their livelihood, they are in no worse position than thousands of other men in the country, and I do not know why the taxpayers of the country should go down in their pockets to recoup them. It appears to me the item should be struck out.

Mr. OLIVER: You might do this as a compromise—

Mr. GRAHAM: Imagine Oliver compromising!

Mr. OLIVER: —give each of the artists a military pension, on the basis of total disablement, with the understanding that they should not paint any more pictures until the war is over.

Sir THOMAS WHITE: If the minister is influenced by politicians, that is one thing; but it is not a charge against a minister that he is influenced by considerations advanced by those who are interested in scientific studies. The remuneration of the men who carry on this work is very small; they work unselfishly and in a disinterested way. Certainly, while I find very little difficulty in standing out against the representations made by the politicians, so to speak, I do find a good deal of difficulty in standing out against the scientific men, men from universities, men engaged in literary or artistic work.

Public Works—chargeable to capital—Ottawa Eastern Departmental Block—new fireproof roof, etc.—revote, $125,000.

Mr. GRAHAM: The minister was going to explain this item the other night.

Mr. REID: I did explain it. The amount is a revote, and is intended to be applied towards fireproofing the old portion of the Eastern Block and rearranging the offices on the top floor.

Mr. PUGSLEY: Surely this item ought to be dropped. There is no intention of spending the money this year.

Mr. REID: If it is at all possible, this work should be undertaken in the interests of the protection of the Eastern Block. The officials thought that we would not be justified in dropping the item, and under the circumstances I should be glad if the committee would allow it to pass.

Mr. PUGSLEY: This amount was voted last year; it has not been spent. If there was good reason for not spending the money last year there is greater reason for not spending it this year. Last year the Minister of Finance was able to borrow money at 5 per cent; this year he is obliged to pay 8 per cent. This roof is probably the same one that has been there for many years; no fire is likely to occur from the outside.

The roof does not require to be fireproofed; protection against fire should be afforded inside the building. I have no doubt that care is exercised in that respect; the police are in constant attendance. When I was minister, work was undertaken for creating a thoroughly fireproof section in the wing where the valuables are kept. In view of the fact that there is a war on, and that it is difficult to get money, and that heavy taxes are being imposed upon the people, this vote ought not to be pressed.

Mr. REID: The part of the building to which my hon. friend refers is not fireproof at the present time; the roof is a wooden one, and it is necessary to rearrange the whole top floor. The Parliament Buildings were there for many years, yet they did not burn down. The officials tell me that the work on the Eastern Block should be proceeded with if at all possible; it should have been proceeded with last year.

Mr. PUGSLEY: Is the roof of the Eastern Block similar to that on the Western Block?

Mr. REID: No, the Western Block had a new roof put on after the fire in that building. The Eastern Block is the only one now that is not fireproof—the new Parliament Building will have a fireproof roof.

Contribution to aid in carrying on the work of the Astronomical Society—further amount required, $1,000.

Sir THOMAS WHITE: The Royal Astronomical Society of Canada is a national society and has centres and groups in Toronto, Montreal, Winnipeg, Ottawa, Regina, Victoria and other important cities in the Dominion. Headquarters are at Toronto: Albert D. Watson, president; J. R. Collins, general secretary. The grant from the Government is used for the purpose of publishing the journal of the society, which disseminates not only articles of scientific interest written by Canadians, but also the best from journals published in other countries. The editors are Professor Chant, Dr. Plaskett and Sir Frederick Stupart. Without the Dominion grant, it is stated, the journal would have to be suspended altogether. The University of Toronto also supports the work of the Society by a small grant. The grant to the society last year was $2,000; I cut it in two for the 1917-18 main Estimates. However, more representations were made to me with regard to the voting of the further $1,000 than were made in respect to any other item in the estimates. It is not the easiest thing in the world to cut down these grants. Representations were made to me from very many quarters indeed that the work of this society, though it might not appeal to the public in general, was really very necessary and desirable scientific work. Taking everything into consideration, I thought that we had better make the usual grant of $2,000.

Mr. OLIVER: This is certainly an occasion when our idols are being shattered. We look to the Minister of Finance to stand as adamant in maintaining a policy of economy, consistent with efficiency. I am sure the committee will feel pained to hear the confession my hon. friend makes tonight and to learn that the treasury is not as we believed it was, founded upon principles of security and economy.

Vancouver harbour improvements, $111,000.

Mr. REID: This appropriation is for a new shed on the wharf at Vancouver. The Public Works Department have built a wharf at Vancouver, and a large elevator has been built on that wharf. One shed has already been built on one side, and now the Public Works Department are building another one exactly the same. The shed

built last year is filled to capacity with general merchandise, and as a consequence business offered to the Harbour Commissioners had to be refused. As a remedy for these conditions they ask that another shed be erected. The chief engineer of the Department of Public Works, in a report dated March 29, 1917, recommends that a wooden freight shed 900 feet long by 87 feet 8 inches wide be built at an estimated cost of $67,500. In a further report, dated 14th June, 1917, he states that only an approximate cost of $100,000 can be given for a freight shed 1,005 feet long by 92 feet wide, equipped with offices, lighting, drainage, plumbing, etc. When I visited Vancouver last fall, I saw this wharf, which is a splendid one and on which there is an elevator and a shed. I know that this second shed is an absolute necessity, and the people of Vancouver have been urging its erection. For that reason we are proceeding with it this year.

Mr. PUGSLEY: I am sorry the hon. member for Vancouver (Mr. Stevens) is not in his seat, because I would like to ask him as to the location of this wharf and as to whether this is the property he referred to some little time ago when he said it had been leased or sold to Mr. Kelly. Is that the property?

Mr. REID: The property was bought from the Hastings Shingle and Mill Company and the Canadian Pacific Lumber Company three or four years ago. The Public Works Department then constructed this large wharf. Later on, the Department of Trade and Commerce built a large elevator on the shore end of the wharf. When the wharf was built, a shed 676 feet long by 78 feet 8 inches wide was erected. That shed has been filled to its capacity. The deputy minister tells me that the freight has been piled all along the other side of the wharf, and this new shed is therefore being constructed for the purpose of handling this excess freight.

Mr. PUGSLEY: It is somewhat anomalous that the Public Works Department should be building the wharf and the Department of Trade and Commerce building the elevator.

Mr. REID: The elevator is on the shore end of the wharf. The wharf extends from the shore out 800 feet.

Mr. PUGSLEY: Why has that departure been made and why is the Department of Trade and Commerce undertaking the erection of the elevator?

Mr. REID: The hon member will remember that the Department of Trade and Commerce have built three or four elevators in the prairie provinces besides this one at Vancouver.

Mr. PUGSLEY. Have they architects in their department?

Mr. REID: The Grain Commission had the plans prepared by those who were submitting tenders.

Mr. PUGSLEY: It seems anomalous that a department which ordinarily has nothing to do with the erection of public buildings, which has no staff of architects, should be undertaking the erection of public buildings. I thought that work peculiarly belonged to the Department of Public Works, excepting, of course, that the Department of Railways probably erect elevators, they having their own staff for such work, I suppose. When was the elevator completed?

Mr. REID: About a year and a half ago.

Mr. PUGSLEY: Has its erection resulted in the transportation of grain through Vancouver?

Mr. REID: Some grain, not a very large quantity, has gone through.

Mr. PUGSLEY: Is any grain stored in this elevator?

Mr. REID: Some, but not a very large quantity. Last fall, when I was at Vancouver, the quantity was not very large, and it was rather for local consumption, but I understand that some will be going there very soon.

Mr. PUGSLEY: What is the explanation of there not being any considerable quantity as was expected?

Mr. REID: The Minister of Trade and Commerce, of course, could explain that more fully than I could. It was expected that the grain would be shipped via the Pacific and through the Panama canal to Liverpool. When the war broke out it was impossible to get tonnage for shipments via that route, and for that reason, I suppose, there has not been the quantity of grain shipped through this elevator that was expected. I heard the Minister of Trade and Commerce saying the other day it was likely that some would go through soon. Some of the new vessels are going through the Panama canal, and they will take a quantity of grain in order to see how grain will go through Vancouver ot Liverpool by that route.

Victoria harbour improvements, further amount required, $370,000.

Mr. REID: This amount of $370,000 is required in addition to the amount of $1,000,000 in the main estimates for the following improvements:

1. Completion of breakwater, under contract with Sir John Jackson (Canada), Ltd.	$ 125,000
2. Completion of piers Nos. 2 and 3, under contract with Grant, Smith & Co., and McDonnell, Ltd.	1,076,340
3. Wooden freight shed on pier 2, 702' x 200'	125,000
4. Car-ferry slip—to provide rail connection with railways and wharves	25,000
5. Trackage—5,400 ft. of trackage, 60-lb. rails	12,000
Inspection	6,660
Total	$1,370,000
Less: Vote in Main Estimates, 1917-18	1,000,000
Vote asked for as above	$ 370,000

Mr. PUGSLEY: Will that all be expended this year?

Mr. REID: Yes, under the contracts that are now running.

Halifax Quarantine Station on Lawlor's Island—water supply, $5,000.

Mr. REID: This vote of $5,000 is to cover the cost of the sinking of an artesian well, providing boiler and pumping engine, making use of the large tank which at present contains salt water, which would be emptied, and pumping the fresh water into this tank. This water would then be distributed through the present fire mains and branches laid to each building. It is considered that the supply of fresh water would be sufficient for both fire and domestic purposes. The estimated cost is as follows: Sinking well, $2,000; boiler, pumping engine and shelter for same, $1,650; laying branches from main to the different buildings, with valves, excavations, etc., $463; incidentals and contingencies, say, $887; total, $5,000.

Mr. A. K. MACLEAN: Has the work been commenced?

Mr. REID: No.

Mr. A. K. MACLEAN: Will you ask for tenders?

Mr. REID: It may be hard to get tenderers. If so, we can do the work ourselves.

Mr. A. K. MACLEAN: There will be no trouble in getting people to do the work. Will the minister ask for tenders? On a public work costing over $5,000 I think the minister is expected to call for tenders.

Mr. REID: The sinking of the well is estimated to cost $2,000, so I think under the Act we could put a well-digger on it. We may, however, call for tenders if the department think it advisable. It is not a very serious matter either way.

St. John old post office—rewiring entire building, $2,000.

Mr. REID: This money is to be applied in entirely rewiring, for electric lighting in an up-to-date manner, the old post office at St. John.

Mr. PUGSLEY: I think it requires it.

Grosse Isle Quarantine Station—new buildings—revote, $123,000.

Mr. PUGSLEY: Why should not that item be left out?

Mr. REID: The Minister of Agriculture cleams that it is absolutely necessary to have this amount voted. He has been pressing for it very hard.

Mr. PUGSLEY: There are no immigrants coming in now.

Mr. REID: It will take a year to get ready for them.

Mr. PUGSLEY: This vote cannot be absolutely necessary, because the money was voted last year and nothing was spent. The minister must see that there is a vast number of items, amounting to a very large sum, which have apparently just been put in in view of the election coming on—for it was not thought necessary to put them in the main estimates. They are put here with the view of making the people believe that a large amount of money is to be spent here and there throughout the country. It is just done to excite hopes which, perhaps, it is not intended to gratify. Why should all these amounts be included in the supplementary estimates under Public Works? Take for instance, this item of $123,000 for Gross Isle quarantine station, which has already cost a large amount of money. This amount was voted last year, so apparently there is no urgency, because not a dollar of money was spent. Why should this item be in now, when it is far more important even than it was last year, to save all the money we can and use it for the purposes of the war?

Mr. REID: We must get ready for the immigration that will come immediately after the war. If we have this vote passed, we

shall be in a position to proceed with the work as soon the war looks to be ending.

Mr. A. K. MACLEAN: You could not commence until next spring, anyway.

Mr. REID: But we can call for tenders. Without a vote, it would be impossible to proceed with this building if the war should cease. We expect immigration after the war, and the Minister of Agriculture claims that this building will be absolutely necessary then.

Mr. A. K. MACLEAN: Will the war end before next spring?

Mr. REID: We thought so last year when this vote was taken.

Mr. PUGSLEY: On what grounds did my hon. friend think so?

Mr. REID: I had my own views, and I think they were shared by a great many other people. To-day some people think the war will last one or two years more, and others think it will be over in the next six months.

Mr. A. K. MACLEAN: What does the minister think?

Mr. REID: I hope it will. At all events, it is better to have this vote passed in case it does, so that we shall be prepared to go on with the work.

Mr. A. K. MACLEAN: Does the minister think that the immigrants will swim across the Atlantic or come over by aeroplane?

Mr. REID: They may come both ways.

Mr. A. K. MACLEAN: That is the only way they can come immediately after the war.

Mr. REID: I do not say that.

Mr. PUGSLEY: There will be very great demand upon transportation facilities to bring our soldiers back to Canada after the war. I do not like the minister to put forward to the House, or that we should approve of the idea, that immediately upon the war being over the Government will rush into all kinds of expenditure like this. As my hon. friend from Halifax (Mr. A. K. Maclean) suggests, it must be quite a time after the war before any immigrants will be able to be transported across the Atlantic. It will take two years at least to get our soldiers back to Canada.

Mr. REID: It would take at least a year to complete this building after work on it was commenced, and by that time surely our soldiers would have been returned. We want to be ready when immigration comes.

Mr. PARDEE: Would it be at all possible that this vote was put on this year and put off last year because the Minister of Customs (Mr. Reid) knew there was not going to be an election last year, and that there is probably going to be one this year? That would not be within the realm of probability, I suppose?

Mr. REID: I would not do that.

Mr. PARDEE: That supposition would not apply to the rest of these items that were in last year, and are now being revoted.

Mr. REID: We struck out all the election ones.

Mr. BURRELL: Perhaps I am responsible for most of these items being here and being pressed. We have been under very serious disability at Grosse Isle. The last time we had much disease there, we had to get tents, because there was absolutely no hospital accommodation. If, after this war, as usually happens after big wars, there should be much typhus or other bad disease, we should be in a most deplorable condition at Grosse Isle.

We have the foundation of a hospital there, and it is a matter of urgency that the buliding should be completed. I have been earnestly pressing this on my colleagues for the past three years. I can assure my hon. friend from Lambton (Mr. Pardee) that there is no politics in this particular vote.

Mr. PARDEE: Perish the thought!

Mr. PUPSLEY: The main estimates for Public Works amount to $16,000,000. That would be a large expenditure even in peace times. Now it is proposed to add nearly $3,000,000, making about $19,000,000 to be voted for Public Works this coming year. The minister would be well advised if he would endeavour to make a reduction, as this is quite without justification.

Mr. REID: The estimates last year were $30,000,000, so there has been a reduction of over $10,000,000. These items are very urgently needed; most of them are small items for repairs that we could not avoid.

Mr. PUGSLEY: The supplementary estimates total $50,000,000, which is away beyond any thing any Government has ever asked. The minister cannct justify the ex-

travagance in his department by comparing this year's estimate with last year's, because the estimate of last year was beyond all reason. The total expenditure of the department during the last three years I was minister was $37,000,000; but in the first three years of this Administration the Public Works estimates ran to $80,000,000 —two and one-half times what they were in the last three years of my administration. The Government went wild over public works, and their extravagance was beyond anything in the history of any country. Now, when the war is on, it is proposed to spend in one year more than one-half of the amount expended in the last three years of Liberal administration during times of peace, when the country was prosperous, when population was increasing, and additional public works were necessary. It is startling that the minister should ask for such a large amount of money.

Mr. REID: While it is true that in the first three years of this Administration the Public Works estimates did increase very much, it must be remembered that the Government undertook the development of all the large harbours, Victoria, Vancouver, St. John, Quebec, Halifax.

Mr. PUGSLEY: Many of these works had been undertaken, and the work at Halifax is, I think, altogether chargeable to the Railways and Canals Department, so that is in addition to this enormous expenditure.

Mr. REID: Even leaving Halifax out, there have been very large expenditures under the Public Works Department for harbour improvements. The expenditure in the last year of the hon. member's administration was $14,338,000.

Mr. PUGSLEY: That was $5,000,000 less than you propose this year.

Mr. REID: In 1915-16 it was $16,150,000. Then there are all these large works for which the contracts have been let and which must be carried out. We are decreasing this year.

Mr. PUGSLEY: You ask for $19,000,000.

Mr. REID: We are decreasing the estimates by $10,000,000 in the Public Works Department, so although we expended $16,000,000 last year, it will be less this year.

Mr. PUGSLEY: You are working for the election year and are asking $4,000,000 more than you expended last year.

[Mr. Pugsley.]

Mr. REID: The hon. member knows it is impossible to estimate the exact amount that will be expended. In the last year of the hon. member's administration he asked for $24,301,475 and expended only $14,338,000, a little more than half. Last year the minister asked for $30,828,000, and expended $16,150,000 about the same proportion.

10 p.m.

Mr. A. K. MACLEAN: I quite agree with the remarks of the hon. member for St. John (Mr. Pugsley). The amounts voted for public works would total enough to meet the immediate necessities of the Canadian Northern railway, which would have obviated our embarking on the very doubtful scheme of government ownership of that road, a scheme which may be the most serious thing this country ever embarked upon. You could not very well drop some of these votes, such as the completion of the contract at Vancouver. This public work was commenced before the war and, of course, must be completed. But there are the items for public buildings in the several provinces.

I think these items might be abandoned for this year. I doubt very much that in any case the expenditures will be made. Then, for my own province of Nova Scotia, I see that there is over $2,000,000 to be voted for harbours and rivers. Speaking generally, I think I may safely say, that none of this money is necessary for the present year. You cannot expend money during the balance of this year for harbours and rivers in Nova Scotia. You cannot get the necessary material. It is difficult to get labour. Furthermore, the season is not convenient for repairs to public wharves and works of that kind. If we vote this $2,000,000 it will not be expended this year. The same is true of New Brunswick, Prince Edward Island, Quebec and Ontario. It is hardly possible to believe that actual expenditures are contemplated under these votes. If they cannot be expended within the next two months, they cannot be expended until next year, in April, May or June, which is the proper time to make expenditures of this kind. Therefore, I agree quite heartily with the remarks made by the hon. member for St. John. It appears unfortunate to ask Parliament to vote these sums at this time. A few months ago, the late Minister of Public Works, in a speech at Montreal, said that he was cutting down the public works expenditures to about $7,000,000 and was eliminating everything. It is quite obvious that these items are not inserted in

the supplementary estimates with the view of making expenditures. There are three or four pages which the minister ought to drop.

Mr. REID: Nearly all these items in the supplementaries are for repairs that are absolutely necessary.

Mr. A. K. MACLEAN: They will not be done.

Mr. REID: The deputy tells me that they have only put in those that are actually necessary and that they will be done.

Mr. PARDEE: Will be done this fall?

Mr. REID: If they are not done this fall they will be done next spring.

Mr. A. K. MACLEAN: Does the minister mean that the money is to be expended during the winter?

Mr. REID: We can get out timber in the winter and get ready if we cannot complete the work before spring.

Mr. A. K. MACLEAN: Then the minister should cut out three or four pages of these items.

Mr. REID: We cannot; they are absolutely necessary.

Mr. CARVELL: There is no trouble about that. In New Brunswick last winter, while the elections were going on, they were making roads and cutting down bushes alongside of the roads.

Grosse Isle Quarantine Station—boiler house, new boilers, etc., $25,000.

Mr. REID: This is required for two new hundred-horse-power boilers and the remodelling of the present boiler house. The two boilers will cost $8,000 setting $3,000; remodelling the boiler house, $10,000, and contingencies $4,000.

Mr. PARDEE: Will this work be done this fall?

Mr. REID: It will be done as soon as the vote is passed.

Quebec post office—enlargement and alterations—additional—revote, $15,000.

Mr. REID: This is required, in addition to the sum of $80,000 in the main estimates, for carrying on the work under contract on the Quebec post office, and for additional work, such as fittings, furniture, lock boxes, heating, sidewalks, fence, elevators, tower clock installation, etc.

Mr. A. K. MACLEAN: When was that new work commenced?

Mr. REID: This work is under contract and this $15,000 is required to finish it. The work of rebuilding the post office in Quebec was started about four years ago.

Three Rivers—new public buildings, $20,000.

Mr. KYTE: This is a vote for a new building entirely according to the statement in the estimates. It is not for a building in course of construction. That certainly is an item which should be allowed to stand.

Mr. REID: This is for a new building, but it is really to finish a building the contract for which was let in January, 1914. The contract was let to Joseph Bourke, of Hull, and he is proceeding with the work.

Galt drill hall—grading, paving, etc., $8,000.

Mr. GRAHAM: That is not new?

Mr. REID: That is for grading and paving, and putting in concrete gutters around around the drill hall already built.

Kemptville public building—$2,100.

Mr. A. K. MACLEAN: What county is Kemptville in?

Mr. GRAHAM: Who represents the riding—or misrepresents it?

Mr. REID: This vote of $2,100 is to provide, first, for balance on a lot 30 feet 2 inches by 92 feet, situate on the north side of the Kemptville public building, the purchase of which was authorized by an Order in Council dated 5th March, 1917, and, secondly, to clear the lot of all burned stone, brick and timber, as well as other debris resulting from the fire of 7th February, 1915, and to level the ground so that it may be made into a lawn; relaying sidewalk on Prescott street. The explanation of that is this: a public building was erected in Kemptville. The lot was purchased prior to 1911.

Mr. GRAHAM: Not this lot.

Mr. REID: No, the lot on which the public building was erected. Adjoining the public building was a store owned by Mundle & Percival. That building took fire and burned down, and did considerable damage to the public building. The people in Kemptville urged that, instead of allowing Mundle & Percival to build on that lot, and possibly endanger the public building, it would be better for the Government to buy the vacant property owned by Mundle & Percival. That would make the public building on the square.

Mr. A. K. MACLEAN: Is this lot to be used as a tennis court?

Mr. REID: I do not know what they will do with it. Mundle & Percival asked a much larger amount than this, and the Public Works Department negotiated with these people, with the result that they purchased it for this amount of $2,000. They wanted a very large amount for the property when the building was on it, but the Public Works Department finally bought it at this figure.

Mr. GRAHAM: I suppose recommendations were made by members.

Mr. REID: No.

Kingston Royal Military College—enlargement of educational block, $150,000—to complete new dormitory by adding two wings, $100,000.

Mr. REID: This vote of $150,000 is asked to make provision towards the extension of the educational block of the Kingston Royal Military College. In their notes on military buildings, dated 14th October, 1912, the Militia and Defence Department stated that in view of the increased number of cadets who are accommodated at the college it is found that the present educational building does not provide ample class-rooms, dining-rooms, recreation rooms, etc., and it is proposed to extend the present build-to this end. The actual accommodation required consists of mess-room, 75x40, for 300 cadets; library; one big lecture hall, which will hold all the cadets at a time for general lectures, etc.; a draughting room; two additional lecture rooms for classes of 50 cadets; and a chemical laboratory for practical work. The present mess, draughting and book rooms in the old building would be used for other purposes. In a reply to a letter from the Deputy Minister of Public Works of 7th June inquiring as to the necessity of a list of works requested by the Department of Militia and Defence to be noted in the supplementary estimates, the Deputy Minister of Militia and Defence, under date 23rd June, states as follows:

I have the honour to acknowledge receipt of your letter of the 7th instant, and to inform you that the various items contained in your letter have been carefully gone into, and it is requested that the following items which are urgently required be provided for in your supplementary estimates: Enlargement of educational block, $150,000; complete new dormitory, adding two wings, $100,000. It is hoped that every effort will be made to provide these items

This extension of the educational block was recommended by the Militia and Defence Department, December, 1913, October 31, 1914, and October 24, 1916.

[Mr. J. D. Reid.]

Mr. GRAHAM: Is it not a fact that applications for admission to this institution had to be refused this year for lack of accommodation?

Mr. REID: That is true.

Mr. GRAHAM: These are big items, and if they were for something else, I would be inclined to oppose them; but the Royal Military College has proved itself such a wonderful institution, and its graduates have shown themselves to be such brave and splendidly equipped men during the present war, that I would hesitate to object to any vote for the improvement of this great college. Even in peace time the education given at the Royal Military College has been such that some of our leading men have been produced by that institution. The training is not, as some people appear to think, only physical, but there is a mental training, and a course of study to equip young men for the activities of life in a practical way, which might well be envied by some other institutions. If those in charge of the Royal Military College assure the Government and Parliament, as I believe they do, that this vote is necessary for the better equipment of this institution, and, as I am privately informed, for the present needs, I would be in favour of passing these items. If it be true, as we have been told it is, that on account of lack of accommodation, applications have been refused this year to young men who wish to enter the Royal Military College, then we cannot too quickly remedy that defect.

Mr. NICKLE: The original educational building is the building now being used for the education of cadets. The cadets are intensely crowded in that building. I think the original scheme of accommodation was for some 80 pupils. Now they have a great many more there, and the demand on the part of young men to enter the college is so great that we have competitive examinations. The second item is to complete the new dormitory by adding two wings. Some five or six years ago, before the dormitory building was erected, one part of it was bricked up. The main building is stone, and, the idea is to remove this brick, and to complete the building by the erection of the additional wing. The commandant tells me it is absolutely essential, if good work is to be done, that further dormitory and educational accommodation must be provided, and those who have followed the history of this war must be aware that a great many of the men who received their training at that institution

have by their conduct won distinction for themselves and for this country.

Mr. GRAHAM: Could the minister explain this: we had in the main estimates quite a number of votes, and we have in the supplementary page after page. Why is it necessary to have supplementary estimates? Why were these items not put in the main estimates?

Mr. REID: The main estimates are made up in October. These are repairs that have become necessary from time to time since then.

Mr. GRAHAM: If the House had not been in session, you would have had to do without these votes.

Ottawa Departmental Buildings — rewiring, etc.—further amount required, $10,000.

Mr. REID: This is to complete work that has been going on in connection with rewiring the public buildings. There yet remain to be done three corridors and 46 rooms in the Langevin block. The estimate was prepared in 1912-13, since which time the cost of labour and material, principally material, has advanced in some cases fifty per cent.

Ottawa—pavements, including Government's share of cost of repaving Sussex street from Rideau street to St. Patrick street, $43,000.

Mr. REID: This covers the following works: repaving Sussex street from Rideau to St. Patrick street, Government's share of cost, $18,785; pavement in front of Government Printing Bureau, $6,200; repairing asphalt pavement on Wellington street, west of Bank, $17,000; repairing Wellington street pavement between Connaught Plaza and Bank street, $1,015.

Mr. PUGSLEY: Is this for paving the roadway?

Mr. REID: Yes.

Mr. PUGSLEY: Is there a law in Ontario that the proprietors pay half the cost of paving the roadway?

Mr. REID: Yes; this is our share of the cost.

Mr. PUGSLEY: Is this our legal share?

Mr. REID: The deputy informs me that the Government are in the same position as private owners.

Ottawa Government Printing Bureau—freight elevators, $8,500.

Mr. REID: This is to provide for two standard electric freight elevators of 6,000 lbs. capacity, at 100 feet per minute, to replace old elevators now operated by steam power in the Printing Bureau at Ottawa.

Prescott public buildings—repairs and renewals—revote, $3,000.

Mr. REID: When I came through Prescott this morning I noticed that they were repairing the buildings there. The chief architect has mentioned during the last two or three years that the buildings required repair; the same view has been expressed by officials in the Post Office and Customs buildings there. The roof has been in very bad shape; the bricks have been falling away from around it. The work really had to be proceeded with this year; it will be completed within the next ten or twelve days.

Stayner—public buildings, $10,000.

Mr. REID: This vote is to provide for the purchase of a site and the erection of a public building in the town of Stayner for post office purposes.

Mr. PARDEE: How big is Stayner?

Mr. REID: The population is 1,200.

Mr. PUGSLEY: What county is it in?

Mr. REID: Stayner is an incorporated town in Simcoe county, Ontario, a station on the Meaford branch of the Grand Trunk railway, nine miles from Collingwood and twenty-three miles from Barrie. It has eighteen stores, three hotels, shingle, planing and woollen mills, one brick kiln, carriage factory, branch bank, printing office, and a weekly newspaper.

Mr. GRAHAM: How does the minister reconcile this vote with his assurance to the House that no new works would be started? An election is coming on and it is thought that a lot ought to be bought in Stayner. We have been assured over and over again that no new works would be started. Here is a violation of that pledge.

Mr. PARDEE: The minister has not given an explanation why he is starting to undertake new works. He has said that no new buildings would be started.

Mr. REID: We will let the item stand until I can get more information.

Item stands.

Manitoba public buildings—Winnipeg—alterations to immigration building No. 1, for accommodation of postal station A, $20,000.

Mr. REID: This vote is to provide interior alterations to immigration building No. 1, at the Canadian Pacific Railway station at Winnipeg, for the accommodation of postal station A.

Mr. PUGSLEY: Is that a wood or a stone building?

Mr. REID: It is a brick building with stone trimmings.

Saskatchewan public buildings—Regina—alterations to Assistant Receiver General's buildings, to accommodate post office, $10,000.

Mr. PUGSLEY: Why is this required?

Mr. REID: This vote of $10,000 is required for alterations to the Assistant Receiver General's building (old Royal Bank), Regina. This will provide for a proper staircase, overhauling heating apparatus, paving lane, installing electric freight elevator, conveyor from present post office across lane, etc. The estimated cost of the proposed alterations is $9,250, with contingencies of $750, or a total of $10,000.

Alberta public buildings—Coutts—immigration building, $2,000.

Mr. PUGSLEY: Where is that?

Mr. REID: That is right on the boundary line, south of Calgary. There are no buildings there. It is where the Canadian Pacific crosses the boundary. This amount of $2,000 is required to reimburse the Department of the Interior for the construction of immigration building at Coutts.

Mr. PUGSLEY: It is right on the international boundary line?

Mr. REID: Yes.

Spirit River—immigration building, $5,000.

Mr. REID: This is to reimburse the Department of the Interior for the erection of an immigration building at Spirit River settlement.

Mr. PUGSLEY: Where is Spirit river?

Mr. REID: It is in Edmonton county. We have a recommendation for this from the hon. member for Edmonton (Mr. Oliver).

British Columbia public buildings—William's Head quarantine station water supply, $150,000.

Mr. PUGSLEY: This is a large item. What is the explanation?

Mr. REID: This amount of $150,000 is required to provide an adequate water supply for the quarantine station at William's Head. The present water supply is obtained from the Quarantine lake, a distance of 3½ miles, and was installed about 1894. It was repaired on many occasions between 1900 and 1913; but constant attention is necessary in stopping leaks, etc. In case of fire the pressure would be greatly inadequate and the chief of the fire department states that the existing conditions are extremely dangerous and unsatisfactory. During the summer months the watershed from which the present water supply is obtained dries up, and there is always a scarcity of water. To overcome this serious drawback it is proposed to obtain a new source of supply. The proposed work consists in the construction of a water main from a point known as "Bray's Farm" on the waterworks system of the city of Victoria, to the quarantine station at William's Head, a distance of about 8½ miles. The construction of this main is in accordance with an offer made by a resolution of the municipal council of the city of Victoria on the 28th May, 1917, as follows:

Resolved, that the Water Commissioner be authorized to submit an offer to the proper official of the Dominion Government to supply water from the city water works to the said quarantine station in accordance with arrangements to be mutually agreed upon, embracing the following general terms and conditions, namely, to sell water to the Dominion Government for this purpose, delivered at a point known as "Braye Farm," at six cents per thousand gallons, the Government to furnish and lay the necessary main, and the city to maintain said main, after it is laid, for a period of five years.

In view of the increasing prices for cast iron pipe it is proposed to use the pneumatic tubes which have been in storage in Toronto for post office purposes and thereby effect a material reduction in the cost of the work. The chief architect of the Department of Public Works in a report dated 23rd June, 1917, states as follows:

Since negotiations with regard to this supply have been in progress the cost of cast iron pipe has advanced very materially. In January, 1917, our resident architect at Victoria estimated the cost of 10-inch water pipe on that date as $52 per ton. I am now in receipt of an estimate from him, dated 22nd June, in which the price is quoted at $85.20 per ton. This difference in cost of cast iron pipe will, of course, very materially affect the estimate for the cost of the work, which was about $150,000.

I have taken up the matter of using the pneumatic tubes which we have in storage in Toronto, with Mr. Chipman, C.E., of Toronto, and have received from him a report as follows:

That from the tests made on the pneumatic tubes he is of the opinion that the pipe would prove satisfactory for water works purposes under a working head not exceeding 300 ft., but before being used they should be thoroughly cleaned, re-coated, tested and weighed; and that greater care will be necessary in laying these pipes than in laying standard cast iron water pipes. The pipes must be laid more closely to grade and to line than with standard pipes. For a long conduit these pipes would be equivalent if not superior to the standard pattern of pipes. He states he would have no hesitation in using these pipes on a water works system provided they were cleaned, coated and tested.

Mr. PUGSLEY: What number of immigrants are coming to William's Head?

Mr. REID: I know there was a very large number last year.

Mr. PUGSLEY: Coming from where?

Mr. REID: The Orient.

Mr. PUGSLEY: This seems to me a very large expenditure for a quarantine station water supply.

Mr. REID: All the vessels have to stop there. I understand there will be more immigrants next year.

Dawson post office—vault, $10,000.

Mr. KYTE: Some days ago I put some questions on the Order Paper with reference to this item. I asked the minister if he had any report from his officials asking that this expenditure be made, and he answered yes. I also asked him to produce the correspondence, and he replied in the affirmative, but I have not received it yet.

Mr. REID: I remember looking up the matter. All who have made recommendations in this matter agree that the vault is in a very bad condition. The deputy minister will send over the correspondence to my hon. friend. I understand that a telegram came not very long ago from Ernest Revard saying that this expenditure was no longer necessary, but that was when he was no longer agent of the Public Works Department. He seems to have changed his mind since he severed his connection with the department.

Mr. PUGSLEY: There is a vault there at present, is there not?

Mr. REID: This vote of $10,000 is to be applied in tearing down and rebuilding the vault in the Dawson post office building, which has been sinking. This vault was not built on a proper foundation in the first place and is gradually dropping down into the earth and at the same time toppling over; in its present condition it is not fireproof, and in the event of the building being destroyed by fire, the vault would be almost certain to topple over and break up, and even if it stood, would not protect the contents from fire.

Dawson being built on a glacial formation, any building or heavy weight, to be substantially placed and remain true in its position, must have foundations put down (12 feet) through the muck and ice over burden to the frozen gravel below. Nothing else will stand. The weight of this vault, as it settles, is shoving over the whole post office building to such an extent that doors and windows have been crushed out of position, the floors and ceilings cracked and pulled down to a slant. The present vault is enclosed in the main building, and it is proposed to erect the new vault outside of and connecting with the building on the inside only. The vault doors will be stationed, and access will be had to them from the main building. The outside dimensions of vault will be 12x14 feet, with stone wall 12 feet high; brick wall on top 25 feet high, and chimney erected at the corner of the vault. The reconstruction of vault has been recommended by the Department of the Interior October 20, 1916, and by Mr. George Black, Commissioner of the Yukon Territory, in a letter dated 24th August, 1916. I also remember seeing a letter from the Collector of Customs, another from the postmaster, and one from Mr. Revard himself.

Mr. KYTE: Does not the minister think it would be well to have an inquiry to verify the facts, inasmuch as Mr. Revard has notified the department that there is no expenditure required, as the vault is in good condition? Does not the minister think it would be well to inquire why Mr. Revard has changed his mind?

Mr. REID: I feel this way about it. Mr. Revard, when agent of the department recommended this expenditure. It has also been recommended by the gentlemen I have mentioned, in all of whom I have confidence. I think that Mr. Revard must have some grievance, and is now trying to prevent this expenditure. At all events, the agent of the department will look into this matter before we proceed with it.

Mr. GRAHAM: Who is the agent?

Mr. REID: No one has been appointed yet.

Mr. KYTE: When did Mr. Revard cease to be the agent?

Mr. REID: I do not know the exact date, but the correspondence will show.

Mr. KYTE: Would the minister let the item stand for the present?

Mr. ROCHE: I had the privilege of being in Dawson city a year ago last summer, and was taken through this building by the officials. It was undoubtedly in a very dangerous condition. The floor had sunk very considerably, and the partitions had drawn away from the ceiling. It was impressed upon me how necessary it was to have this vault rebuilt. I know nothing

whatever as to the expenditure, but most assuredly the building was in a very dangerous condition.

Item stands.

Public buildings—rents, repairs, furniture, heating, etc., $324,000.

Mr. REID: There is an increase in this item, owing to the advance in the price of coal, of about 20 per cent.

Mr. PUGSLEY: What is the price of coal to the Government in Ottawa?

Mr. REID: It is $9.25 a ton.

Mr. McKENZIE: I have been informed by a citizen of Ottawa that the fuel controller has no authority under the Order in Council appointing him to enforce his injunctions or to inflict punishment for infringement of them.

Mr. REID: The intention was that the fuel controller was to get the coal to parties in Canada at a reasonable price. I should prefer to look over the Order in Council before saying just what his powers are.

Progress reported.

On motion of Hon. Mr. Reid, the House adjourned at 11 p.m.

Tuesday, September 4, 1917.

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

REPORT PRESENTED.

List of shipping, issued by the Department of Marine and Fisheries, being a list of vessels on the registry books of the Dominion of Canada on the 31st December, 1916.—Hon. Mr. Hazen.

THE MILITARY SERVICE COUNCIL.

Right Hon. Sir ROBERT BORDEN (Prime Minister) laid on the Table copy of Order in Council, dated 3rd September, 1917, appointing the Deputy Minister of Justice, Oliver Mowat Biggar, of the city of Edmonton; John H. Moss, of the city of Toronto; Louis Loranger, of the city of Montreal, and Lieutenant Colonel H. A. C. Machin, of the town of Kenora, Ont., a council to advise and assist in the administration and enforcement of the Military Service Act, 1917, to be known as the Military Service Council; the Deputy Minister of Justice to be chairman of the council.

[Mr. Roche.]

SUPPLY.

The House in Committee of Supply, Mr. Stewart in the Chair.

Harbours and rivers—Nova Scotia—Ben Eoin—wharf, $2,200.

Mr. KYTE: Is this for the construction of a new wharf?

Mr. REID: These small items are for repairs at different places.

Mr. KYTE: When is this money to be spent?

Mr. REID: As soon as the vote is passed. In some cases work is being proceeded with now.

Mr. SINCLAIR: Will the minister explain why he has dropped certain items that were in the estimates during the last few years and introduced new ones? For the last five or six years there has been in the estimates an item for a wharf at Cole harbour—which is as necessary, in my judgment, as any wharf proposed to be built on the coast of the Maritime Provinces. This item has been dropped from the estimates, and certain other items dealing with works not nearly so important have been introduced. This is not an isolated case; quite a number of projected works in estimates and new items have been in Nova Scotia have been dropped from the Estimates and new items have been inserted in their places without any apparent reason. Upon what principle has the minister made up these supplementary estimates?

Mr. REID: This amount is required to construct a creosoted timber wharf 175 feet long and 16 feet wide—with a head block 20 by 30 feet—and a small warehouse thereon, 10 by 14 feet. The estimated cost is $1,634.50, made up as follows: creosoted piling, $819.60; native round logs, $25.20; dimension timber, $260; timber, plank covering, $163.20; driving and securing 40 piles, $147; sand and gravel in approach, $34.50; warehouse, $175; land, $10; total, $1,634.50; superintendence, contingencies, etc., $365.50; total, $2,000. Add ten per cent for advance in prices of labour and material since the report was made, $200. This is really a new work; it is in the constituency of Cape Breton South.

Mr. KYTE: I understood that this was a new work, and I was rather surprised at the minister saying this item was for repairs.

Mr. REID: I was speaking about the preceding item.

Mr. KYTE: We are discussing this one. I would like the minister to read the report recommending the construction of this wharf.

Mr. REID: District Engineer Bernasconi, in his report of March 20, 1915, says:

> There are at present seven public wharves on the shores of East Bay, fairly well distributed, with the exception of the shore between Big Pond and the head of East Bay, a distance of 12 miles. The proposed wharf at Ben Eoin would be about midway between these points and would fill the gap and give the required accommodation to the inhabitants of that section of the district. The site for the proposed wharf is owned by Mr. Joseph McLellan, who offers to sell the land required for the sum of $10, which price I consider fair and just.

That is the official information.

Mr. KYTE: Will the minister explain why it is that, report having been received in 1915, no appropriation has been placed in the estimates until now?

Mr. REID: I cannot explain that. The estimates, of course, were made out by the Minister of Public Works. These are the explanations furnished by the department, and I cannot give any others.

Mr. KYTE: Does the minister think there is more money with which to build wharves this year than there was in 1914?

Mr. REID: I am not doing any thinking on this; it is an estimate of the Department of Public Works.

Mr. KYTE: If the minister is not doing any thinking, it would be a good idea for him to do some.

Mr. REID: I am satisfied that the Minister of Public Works would not insert this item unless he thought it was absolutely necessary.

Mr. KYTE: For election purposes.

Mr. REID: No.

Mr. KYTE: The report says that there are seven wharves already in East Bay, but inasmuch as there is a distance of 12 miles between two wharves, it is important that this wharf should be built. I very much regret that the hon. member for St. Antoine (Sir Herbert Ames) is not here. He might perhaps produce the plan which he laid upon the table of this House in 1910 or 1911, and on which he had marked out the number of wharves in the Maritime Provinces built by the late Government, as he said, without any justification. This is another case in which the Government appear to have gone back on whatever record they made, when they were in Opposition, with respect to the expenditure of money upon wharves. I am as much interested in the convenience of the people of my district as the acting Minister of Public Works can possibly be, but the people of my district realize the necessity for economy on the part of the Government, and I beg to assure the minister that they understand why this estimate is brought before Parliament at the present time. A request was made three years ago for the building of a wharf at that point. That request was not complied with. Year after year went by; estimates were voted by Parliament, but no provision was made for the building of this wharf until the year 1917. If this item had been placed in the main estimates for 1917-18, the Government might still be entitled to some credit for discharging a public duty; but inasmuch as provision for the building of this wharf is made only in the supplementary estimates, which came down after it was determined by the Government that there should be an election, we can all realize the motive that actuated the minister. If there ever were a time when provision for expenditure on new work ought not to be made, it certainly ought to be now, and I would suggest—and I take all responsibility necessary for making this suggestion—that the minister drop this item out of the estimates.

Mr. CARROLL: I know something about the location of this wharf, and the engineer who reported to the minister that there were seven wharves in East Bay must have been seeing seven times as many wharves as he should have seen. There are not seven wharves in East Bay. Three years ago I forwarded a petition from the people at the head of East Bay to this Government asking for repairs to a wharf which has been of considerable service to the inhabitants of that place, and which is quite near East Bay church in the vicinity of which the larger proportion of the people live. The Department of Public Works paid no attention to the matter, and, as a result, that wharf is absolutely useless and worthless to the people of that section. Has the minister any plan showing how the people who would be served by this proposed wharf are going to get to the main road? It is about two and one-half miles from the main road, and there is absolutely no communication. If the minister wishes to have a wharf which will be of service to the people, he should repair that wharf which has been

allowed to go to ruin. Instead of there being seven wharves, there is one on the south side of East Bay in the constituency which I represent and another on the north side of East Bay in the constituency represented by my hon. friend from North Cape Breton (Mr. McKenzie). There must be some mistake in the report.

Mr. BRADBURY: That is too bad. So ne more wharves should be built there.

Mr. CARROLL: I am not complaining about this wharf. Of course, my hon. friend knows all about this wharf as he knows, or pretends to know, whether he does or not, about wharves in all parts of the country. I am simply giving to the minister information which I think he should have. I am not objecting to the item at all.

Mr. MORPHY: The hon. member for Richmond (Mr. Kyte) asks that this item be dropped.

Mr. CARROLL: If my hon. friend (Mr. Bradbury) would attend to his business and endeavour to give information to the minister as I am trying to do, he would get along very well. I do not interrupt my hon. friend when he is giving information to the minister in regard to matters in his riding. The Minister of Public Works should investigate this matter and take into consideration the petition sent in to the department three years ago for repairs to a wharf at the head of East Bay. Perhaps the deputy minister will remember about the petition which was signed by a large section of the inhabitants there, headed, I think, by the clergyman in charge of the parish.

Mr. REID: I have no other information than this before me, and the officials of the department have given me the report of the officer in charge of that district who recommends that this wharf should be built. As I understand the hon. member, this wharf which it is proposed to be built is in his constituency.

Mr. CARROLL: Yes.

Mr. REID: I have the plans here showing the proposed wharf. Do I understand the hon. member to say that this wharf is not required and that he wants the item struck out, because if he does I will strike it out.

Mr. CARROLL: If the minister will guarantee to me that he will look at the Government wharf at the head of the south side of East Bay, and instead of spending the money on this wharf, will spend it on repairing that wharf, which will better serve the people at Ben Eoin, I shall be satisfied.

Mr. REID: I cannot make any such guarantee, because we cannot expend any amount on repairs on some other wharf unless the item is placed in the estimates just as this one has been. Therefore, if I strike out this item the matter of the repairs to the wharf mentioned by the hon. member will, of course, have to be taken up by the department, and if the situation is as he describes, an item can be inserted in the estimates next session.

Mr. CARROLL: So far as I am concerned, I would recommend the striking out of this item.

Mr. REID: I will strike it out.

Mr. CARROLL: It amounts to $2,200. This wharf would not serve the public at that point at all. The minister need not think I am afraid of striking out any item that is not going to serve the people.

Mr. REID: I am not saying that.

Mr. CARROLL: The engineer may have been misinformed. It would have been better had the department done as it was requested to do, namely, to make repairs to the wharf at the head of East Bay. I see no good in building a wharf at this particular place. I would be glad if the minister would show me on the plan how he is going to get from the proposed wharf at Ben Eoin on to the main road.

Mr. REID: The right of way is marked on the plan, showing how you can get to the wharf.

Mr. CARROLL: You will have to buy the right of way.

Mr. REID: The man is willing to sell it for $10.

Mr. CARROLL: That is cheap enough.

Mr. SINCLAIR: I think the minister is mistaken when he says he has not the power to change an item in the estimates. I know for a fact that he has done it in reference to a wharf in my constituency. Prior to the defeat of the late government a sum of money was voted for the building of a wharf at Sand Point, on the Strait of Canso. More than that, a contract was entered into, and the material collected for the building of the wharf, but when the present government came into power their friends in that locality persuaded them to

change the site of the wharf to another place further down the Strait. The reason for making this change was that the government wanted to purchase a site from a Conservative heeler in that locality, as a reward for his political services. The wharf was built at this new location, and then it turned out that there was not enough water there to make the wharf of any service to the people. The intention was to build a wharf at which the steamer which plies between Guysborough and Mulgrave could call, but the water is so shallow the steamer is unable to come in, and consequently the wharf is no good to anybody. The owner of the land got his purchase price for it, and he was the only person who benefited by the expenditure of $5,000 at that point. So there is one case in which the minister changed an item in the estimates, and if he was able to change an item then, he ought to be able to change one now for my hon. friend from South Cape Breton.

The minister has never answered my question as to the principle which is acted upon in making up the estimates. I have pointed out to him that there has been an item in the estimates for the last six years for the building of a wharf in my constituency at a point where it is very much needed. Time after time the minister and his predecessors have promised to construct the wharf. The point where this wharf is required is not in the woods, where there are no roads or people, but in a thickly settled district, and the people of Cole Harbour, Charlos' Cove, Cashin's Cove and American Harbour have all asked that it be built. The minister has cut that item out of the estimates, and in its place has an item for the building of a wharf at Ben Eoin, where apparently there are no inhabitants and no roads to give access to the wharf. I should like the minister to tell the committee on what principle he makes these changes in the estimates.

Mr. REID: There are, of course, many wharves in the province of Nova Scotia, and applications are coming in every year for new wharves. Some of these applications are put off from time to time, but each year the minister takes up the most pressing cases, and selects those which he thinks are the most urgent. These items are all small amounts. Personally I feel that the people who have not the advantage of railway accommodation should have the benefit of wharves, and that these should be much closer together than in the older settled parts of Canada where there are railway facilities. I have never raised any objection, and never will, to giving the people along the Atlantic coast proper wharf accommodation. The hon. member says that he knows of a case where the money was not spent where it was intended to be spent. My information is that the department do not know of a case of that kind, nor do they understand that it is possible to change the location when the vote has specified the point at which the money must be spent. But it may happen that the engineer may move the site a hundred feet or perhaps half a mile if he thinks it will be an improvement, and that is quite within the spirit of the law.

Mr. CARROLL: But this money has not been voted yet.

Mr. REID: It is in the estimates, and if the item goes through, the wharf will be constructed at that point. Possibly there may be other points in the hon. member's constituency where the need is more pressing; that is a matter of opinion. I have never been in that locality, and my hon. friend knows it better than I do, but the officials of the department down there say that that is the point where this wharf should be built.

Mr. CARROLL: They are not doing their duty.

Mr. REID: A number of people live in that locality.

Mr. CARROLL: Not where the wharf is to be; nobody lives there at all.

Mr. REID: Ben Eoin is situated on the southern shore of East bay, thirteen miles southwest of the city of Sydney, which is the nearest railway station. It has a population of about a hundred, whose principal occupation is farming and fishing.

Mr. CARROLL: My hon. friend is referring to East Bay. At Ben Eoin there are only about seven families, and if the wharf is built at that point, it will be right at the bottom of a mountain. Half a mile down the shore at East Bay, where the population is, there has been a wharf for a great many years, perhaps for half a century, and it has been kept in repair by succeeding governments.

It serves the people of East Bay, the 100 families the hon. gentleman refers to, together with the seven or eight families on the mountain of Ben Eoin, four miles from East Bay. Three or four years ago, or more, the wharf got into disrepair, and a petition was sent to the Government to have

it repaired. There was no necessity for buying land there. If the Government spend $500 on the old wharf, which is in the centre of the population, they will be serving the whole neighbourhood. I think it is unfair to the people of East Bay that this wharf should be built at Ben Eoin, and that the wharf in their own county should be left to go to destruction. I am taking this point in the interest of the people themselves. I know the locality almost as well as I know this Chamber. I am surprised that any engineer should say there were seven wharves in East Bay, and that this wharf is serving 100 families.

Mr. REID: If we put this vote through I do not see that it can be used for repairs to a wharf at some other place.

Mr. CARROLL: I understood the minister to say he would strike it out, if I recommended it. I would not recommend the striking out of anything that would benefit the people in my riding. I would be a foolish man to do anything which was not beneficial to them, if I intended to go back for re-election. That is certainly logic. I am recommending this item should be struck out because it is not in the public interest.

Mr. REID: Then we will strike it out.

Mr. PUGSLEY: I remember something taking place about this matter when I was minister, and I remember that I was pressed to take over that old wharf and put it in repair. Does the minister think there is a prominent place in East Bay where the wharf could be properly placed? Why not insert the word "Ben Eoin wharf, at or near East Bay?" We need not strike out the item.

Mr. REID: If the hon. gentleman thinks the wharf should not be built there I do not want to keep the item in the estimates, but I think it would be better to leave it in, and before the department would proceed with it they could look thoroughly into the matter and decide on the proper course. However, I do not think we should waste time over it, and I move that the item be struck out.

Mr. CARROLL: Would it be in order to make a motion to use $1,600 of this money to make improvements on the wharf at East Bay?

The CHAIRMAN (Mr. Dugald Stewart): No.

[Mr. Carroll.]

Mr. A. K. MACLEAN: This vote is for the construction of a new wharf, and there are several votes under the headings "Harbours and Rivers—Nova Scotia," for new wharves. The Minister of Finance solemnly promised Parliament, on more than one occasion, during the last two years, that no new public works would be undertaken. The late Minister of Public Works also promised Parliament the same thing. I say that on that ground the item should be dropped. This item of $97,000 for new wharves and repairs in Nova Scotia should be struck from the estimates. Every single item of such a character should be dropped, for the reason that the money will not be expended this year. It is practically impossible to effect repairs to wharves late in the year; it will not be possible to place this work in the hands of competent men before October or November, and it will then be too late. Parliament must meet again before March 31 of next year. There will then be sufficient time to vote these moneys, and no useful purpose can be served by voting them now.

Mr. DAVIDSON: I sincerely hope the minister will not yield to request of the hon. member for Halifax. Nearly all these items are for repairs, and a dollar spent now may mean a saving of a thousand dollars later on, and prevent a good deal of hardship.

Mr. A. K. MACLEAN: We will attend to it next year.

Mr. DAVIDSON: The hon. gentleman says this is not the time to spend money on wharves in Nova Scotia. I desire to say that from now to the middle of November is the most feasible and practical time for such expenditure. The farmers are not very busy now, and we are having our best weather. I am absolutely astounded to hear the hon. member for Halifax objecting to a paltry expenditure of a little money for repairs to keep the wharves of that province in proper condition. I believe his statement will be received with a great deal of regret and astonishment by the people of his province.

Mr. A. K. MACLEAN: Not at all.

Mr. CLEMENTS: I have no interest in the matter, and it makes no difference to me whether the items are struck out or not, but I want to say that I represent a constituency three times the size of Nova Scotia, and I have a coast line three times the length and breadth of that province,

and I can assure the hon. gentleman there are no items for new works in my province, the items being all for repairs. I am very glad that the hon. gentleman did not include British Columbia in his request for cutting out the items. Our waters are infested with teredo, which are very destructive to wharves. I have known piles 18 inches thick to be cut off by teredo in British Columbia in one year. I hope the hon. gentleman from Halifax will not press his request. When a wharf needs immediate repair it is good policy to attend to it at once, because, by spending a dollar, you save an expenditure of ten or fifteen dollars. I assure the members for the Maritime Provinces that, so far as British Columbia is concerned, there is no necessity for any arguments with regard to new wharves, because all the items in the supplementary estimates for that province are for repairs only. Practically three-quarters of the coast line in British Columbia are in my own constituency.

Mr. CHISHOLM: My only difficulty in regard to this question is that all these repairs are required this spring. I called the attention of the Government to several works in my own county, when the general estimates were brought down, and I am surprised that the hon. gentleman from Annapolis did not protest then that these items were not contained in the main Estimates, because, if they had been in those estimates, there would be some hope of having the money spent this year.

Mr. REID: The general estimates were made out last October.

Mr. CHISHOLM: I can tell the hon. gentleman that, so far as my county is concerned, all the works provided for in the supplementary estimates were necessary, and this money was required four years ago. The Government has failed, year after year, to put one dollar in the estimates for repairs in the county of Inverness. I can assure the hon. gentleman that all the works in Nova Scotia are in the same position. Here we have $18,000 for repairs and improvements for Margaree harbour. I succeeded in getting the Public Works Department to look after this important public work in Margaree, but if it had been attended to four years ago an expenditure of $1,800 additional to the amount expended would have been sufficient. I protested against the failure of the Government to look after it, and to-day we have $18,000 in the estimates to repair the destruction which has occurred in the last four years. The Government cannot say that they did not know the conditions in that district because I warned them continually year after year for four or five years. I believe they repeatedly found this in that one instance.

There is another item for Port Hood wharf. There is a wharf which cost this country about $40,000 and the Government let this wharf go into decay and destruction year after year, for five years. I pointed out to the department how this work was going to decay. Neither the Minister of Public Works nor the Government paid any atteention to my warning. The surprise to me is that at this moment, preceding an election, I find $6,000 to do a work of repair that will cost about $35,000 or $40,000. I find the same conditions along the coast from one end of the county to the other. There are seven or eight votes that cannot be spent this fall with any reasonable results, and the work of destruction is going on all the time. Every fall, for the last four years, when there has been any agitation around Margaree with respect to municipal politics, or something of that kind, you would find a dozen of men at work in October or November. The foreman was getting his full time although he did not put in more than forty-eight hours a week. I find no fault with the foreman, under the circumstances he could do no better. This was going on during October and November. I told the Minister of Public Works that that was an awfully poor way of spending the money. If they attempt to get any work done along our coast after September they cannot get good results. If the foreman were authorized early to go to work he could get honest results. The timber is growing in the woods yet.

Mr. DAVIDSON: Will my hon. friend allow me——?

Mr. CHISHOLM: No, I am not done yet. Let my hon. friend possess his soul in patience and not be in so much of a hurry. With regard to the work which is provided for here, if the minister will give me the assurance that they will go on with the work immediately, I will point out several expenditures that he might get results from. But, I anticipate that it will be impossible. The Department of Public Works have not the machinery at work to enable them to put the material out before October. If they cannot get the men

at work by October it is a crime to spend the money there.

Mr. DAVIDSON: Does the hon. gentleman advocate striking out the items in so far as they appertain to the county of Inverness?

Mr. CHISHOLM: My hon. friend in this thinks he is smart. I advocated for the last five years that expenditures should be made every year in order to preserve the public works in Inverness. Had the Government acted upon my advice they would not have had to expend within 20 per cent of the money that they will now have to expend to put these works in repair. I am not particularly worried as to whether we leave these items in the estimates or not if I have not the assurance of the minister that they will be spent because this Parliament will meet again next winter and whether we have these items in the supplementary estimates now or whether they are in the estimates when this Parliament meets next winter, makes very little difference. But, the hon. gentleman does not think I am silly enough to ask that any of these items be struck out. I have been advocating for the last five years that these works should be kept in repair.

Mr. DAVIDSON: The hon. gentleman thinks I must be under the impression that I am smart because I asked him to answer a plain, straightforward question. I hope nothing I have said will indicate that I have any great conceit or that I think I am particularly smart. I would think it a fair inference to be drawn that when items are inserted in the estimates, and when an hon. gentleman who is usually silent, gets up and protests, he must want them struck out. That is the only inference I can draw and I am afraid I cannot get very much light from his answer. If hon. gentleman opposite had not consumed so much of the time of this Parliament, if they had allowed the business to proceed more expeditiously, these items would have been passed several months ago and the money would have been available in the early summer. But, I cannot agree with the hon. gentlemen when he says it is impracticable to spend any money this fall. October is a very desirable month in which to spend money. The hon. gentleman seems to be incensed because certain expenditures have been provided for and yet the moment these items are placed in the estimates they meet with a protest from the desk mate of the hon. gentleman. I can understand why the Government might be a little reluctant to make expenditures in Nova Scotia when the members sitting for these seats themselves are the first to get up and protest. We had a case this afternoon. There is in the estimates an item for Cape Breton county and a protest against it comes from the hon. member who represents that county. Then, when we come to an item for Inverness county, the hon. junior member for Halifax (Mr. A. K. Maclean) vehemently protests against any item of that kind being inserted in the estimates at any time during the period of the war. I think hon. gentlemen can hardly expect the Government to be very liberal when their action in this respect meets with so much opposition from hon. gentlemen opposite. If the hon. member for Inverness is anxious to have money spent in his county on needed repairs he should desist from criticism of the expenditures.

Mr. CHISHOLM: I do not want my hon. friend (Mr. Davidson) to create the impression that I protest against these items. I protest against the idea of placing these items in the supplementary estimates when it will be impossible to spend the money this fall. And my hon. friend should be able to understand plain English before he undertakes to put questions which cannot do more than expose his lack of common understanding. I protested that these items should have been contained in the general or supplementary estimates of last year, the year before and the year before that so that something could be accomplished. My hon. friend twits me because I am not heard very often in this House. I am heard whenever occasion demands it and the interests of my county need attention and my country in my judgment needs my opinion.

Mr. DAVIDSON: No, not at all. I did not mean that my hon. friend was not heard from often.

Mr. CHISHOLM: He is surprised that men like myself who do not often address this House should get up and offer any criticism to items of this kind. The business of this House would be expedited if there were more members like myself and if they possessed a little particle of modesty.

Mr. REID: I could not agree to strike out any of these items.

Mr. CHISHOLM: I must protest again; I never asked it. He desires to put me in a false light. I want every item and ten

times as many and the need of Inverness requires it.

Mr. REID: At any rate the hon. junior member for Halifax said that he thought that they should be all struck out. I am not referring to the hon. member for Inverness. The main estimates were made up in October. These items were all taken up during the winter and this list has been made out. In making out the list of these repairs, the officials of the department take the reports of the engineers in the district and collect the ones that in their opinion are the most urgent. I believe that every hon. member, no matter on what side of the House he is, will admit that the repairs on the list are actually required at the places which are named.

Mr. CHISHOLM: Certainly.

Mr. REID: The Minister of Public Works, in selecting the places thought to be most urgent, did not select all the places where repairs might be done. He has taken wharves in Inverness, Cape Breton, Cumberland and other counties and he was very fair in making his selection. I agree that there are many other wharves which probably require repairs but some of them are not so urgent as others. Under the circumstances it does strike me that the hon. member should allow these small amounts to go through. As far as completing these repairs is concerned, hon. members know that the amounts are small.

There is no reason why any one of these votes could not be spent this fall; they are for small repairs, and it would surely be better, if these wharves require repairs, that they should be made and that the people should have the benefit.

Mr. CARROLL: The minister having struck out the item for Ben Eoin wharf, to which I objected, I am in accord with everything else that is proposed to be done in my county. The new wharf at Grand Mira is an absolute necessity, and so are all the repairs to wharves in Cape Breton county.

Mr. REID: I think it would have been better to have left the vote for Ben Eoin wharf in and to have carried on the work if possible.

Mr. SINCLAIR: The hon. member for Inverness (Mr. Chisholm) has made a serious charge against the department: that although he called attention to the need of inexpensive repairs to the breakwater at Margaree harbour five years ago, nothing was done, and the breakwater has been so damaged that it is now necessary to spend this large amount of $18,000 to make the repairs. If that is true, it is criminal neglect, and some one ought to be held accountable for it.

Mr. REID: Frequently, when statements of that kind have been made in this House, I have found from the reports of the engineers that they are not well founded. The hon. member may possibly have had a report from some one in the locality who wanted a little work.

Mr. CHISHOLM: When I make a statement I generally know what I am talking about. I live within half a mile of this wharf, and, when the weather is fine, I go down there about once a day. I have gone out of my way to get all the information necessary. I have written the department and interviewed the minister in regard to this work many times, and it will be news to the people of that locality that the minister thinks that right treatment has been given to that public work for the last five years. I venture to say that $38,000 will not fully repair that wharf. In 1911 there was a vote of $10,000 in the general estimates to be spent there, but it was not spent. Small sums were spent each year, in October and November when results could not be accomplished, and that has been the great difficulty.

Mr. REID: I have looked at the official explanation of this vote, and my hon friend seems to be quite mistaken. This $18,300 is not to repair a breakwater.

Mr. CHISHOLM: I did not say that nor could I, because I do not know yet what it is for.

Mr. REID: He was arguing on the assumption that it was for the breakwater. It is for repairing the breakwater; but, in addition to that, it is for the building of a proposed sand groin 550 feet long and 15 feet wide, a new work entirely.

Mr. MARCIL: Is this new work a war time work?

Mr. REID: The hon. member for the county will agree that it is necessary to repair this breakwater. The sand groin is erected opposite the breakwater to protect it from the action of the waves.

4 p.m.

Mr. MARCIL: It is not to protect the country from the Huns is it?

Mr. REID: I am glad my hon. friend takes an interest in protecting the country from the Huns, and if this breakwater or any other will prevent the Huns from landing there, I am sure every member will support it.

Mr. MARCIL: We are told there would be no new works during the war.

Mr. REID: This is repairing an old work. I am sure the hon. member for the county will agree that this sand groin is necessary to protect the breakwater. This sand groin is to be 550 feet long and 15 feet wide, and the estimated cost is $7,500. In addition to that, there is an item for dredging the channel at the entrance, $6,000, which is not applied to work on the breakwater. I mention this only to show that the hon. member did not understand the nature of the vote.

The CHAIRMAN (Mr. D. Stewart): The committee has been discussing the item of Margaree harbour, which we have not yet reached. It would be better if this discussion was discontinued and resumed when the proper item is called.

Mr. REID: The hon. member for South Cape Breton says that the item now under consideration is not necessary; we will strike it out.

Mr. MARCIL: When an engineer of the department makes a report and the minister accepts it, is it the policy of the department to throw out the item simply because a member says that the work is unnecessary?

Mr. REID: The member for South Cape Breton knows the locality; he says that this work is unnecessary because there is another wharf about a mile from the place where this wharf is proposed to be constructed. He says that this wharf would serve only seven or eight families. Under the circumstances, pending further investigation, I am willing that the item be struck out.

Mr. MARCIL: Does the hon. gentleman not ask that the old wharf be repaired?

Mr. REID: Yes, but I cannot change a vote for the construction of a wharf to a vote for repairs to another wharf a mile away.

Mr. PUGSLEY: The report of the engineer shows that the wharf is really intended to be at East Bay. The report says that there are one hundred families where this proposed wharf is to be built; the one hundred families are at East Bay, not at Ben Eoin. The member for South Cape Breton does not want a wharf constructed half a mile or so from a settled district where there are a large number of families and where there is already a wharf, although it is in bad repair. If you build a wharf half a mile away from a settled district you create division of opinion in the community; the tendency is to take the business away from the settlement and to establish a little community in a new place, which is extremely objectionable. I have always endeavoured to see that the necessary public accommodation was afforded in the settled localities.

The CHAIRMAN: I have no motion before me with reference to this item. The minister simply said that he was willing to strike it out.

Mr. CARROLL: Mr. Chairman, I will make a motion.

The CHAIRMAN: I cannot receive a motion from the hon. gentleman.

Mr. REID: I move that the item be struck out.

Mr. GRAHAM: It would be a mistake to say that the Chairman could not receive a motion from the member for South Cape Breton.

The CHAIRMAN: I was mistaken; I had something else in my mind at that moment.

Motion agreed to, and item struck out.

Boularderie Centre—repairs to wharf, $625.

Mr. McKENZIE: I have no doubt that these repairs are quite necessary; I know the wharf well. A good deal of money has been spent upon a wharf at New Campbellton, but the work has never been completed. What was expended will go to waste unless something be done to keep the wharf in repair and to complete the work. I would suggest that the minister get a report on the matter.

Mr. REID: I shall bring the matter to the attention of the department and have the information placed on record when the estimates for next session are being considered. They are generally considered in the month of October.

Mr. McKENZIE: If the minister could get a little money to put that wharf in repair, he should not wait until next year.

Mr. REID: We might take it out of the general vote.

Mr. McKENZIE: Mr. Bernasconi, the government engineer at North Sydney, could report on it. New Campbellton is only a short distance from the town of North Sydney.

Cow bay (Port Morien)—repairs to breakwater, $1,800.

Mr. REID: Assistant District Engineer Cooper reported on February 6, 1917, as follows:

The face-timbers on inner side of the head block have been eaten away and the bays back of this face have had the ballast washed out by the under-tow that continually heaves around the corner. The covering and stringers on the outer head are also in a bad condition and to repair this part I beg to recommend placing a concrete block, 25 feet in length and of the dimensions shown on the accompanying plan and in placing a concrete covering over the outer head block.

Mr. CARROLL: Was any money spent on this work this year?

Mr. REID: No.

Mr. CARROLL: During the last few years an amount of money has been spent there every summer in extending the breakwater. The tidal water is very strong there; it has been found necessary to put concrete wings on the breakwater.

Mr. REID: My memorandum shows that this breakwater was built by the owners of the Gowrie coal mine on the north side of the bay, and came under the charge of the department in 1873. It originally extended 1,347 feet, to 17 feet at low or to 23 feet at high water, and was about 44 feet in width. The area of the basin enclosed between it and the shipping pier of the Gowrie mines, now the property of the Dominion Coal Company, was 17 acres, 10 acres of which had a depth of from 9 to 17 feet at low water. The breakwater was seriously damaged during the gale of August 24, 1873. Large expenditures have been made from time to time in extending and repairing the work. During the year ending March 31, 1915, the sum of $4,075.76 was expended in completing the placing of concrete blocks for the protection of the seaward face of the work. Work was done by day labour During the year ended March 31, 1916, the sum of $1,850.54 was expended by day labour on procuring a derrick with winch and in constructing and placing large concrete blocks along the seaward face of the breakwater, over a distance of 53 feet, thereby completing the concrete blocks' protection on the seaward face of the breakwater.

Mr. CARROLL: This is a work that should be undertaken right away. It is in a sort of a basin in which the wind does not have much effect, and if the work were undertaken now, it could be finished this fall.

Mr. REID: The work will be undertaken as soon as the estimate is passed.

Cribbin's Point—repairs to wharf, $1,500.

Mr. SINCLAIR: When is it proposed to do this work?

Mr. REID: There should not be any trouble to do this work within the next two or three months. The work is to be done by day labour; $1,004 out of the $1,500 is for timber and planking, and $200 is for removal of old work.

Mr. SINCLAIR: Has the material been purchased?

Mr. REID: No.

Mr. SINCLAIR: No part of the money has been expended up to date?

Mr. REID: No money has been spent because the estimate has not yet been passed, but the intention is to go to work at once on all these small works in these different localities.

Mr. SINCLAIR: What has become of a number of other items for works in the county of Antigonish? I cannot say from memory the names of all the places, but a list of them has been put before the House several times by Mr. William Chisholm the former member. They were voted some years ago for the purpose of carrying a local election in that constituency. They were repeated in the estimates for a number of years, and they have now disappeared altogether. Does the minister ever intend to renew those items?

Mr. REID: I think the Minister of Public Works explained, on the main estimates that he had dropped a long list of items for new work that he did not consider it necessary to proceed with during the present season. I suppose the items mentioned by the hon. members were among those that disappeared in that way.

Eastern harbour (Cheticamp) retaining wall, $1,000.

Mr. REID: This is required to construct a dry rubble retaining wall asked for by the fishermen.

Mr. CHISHOLM: I have been advocating this work for some time. It is very desirable.

Fourchu—extension of wharf, $4,200.

Mr. KYTE: When is this work to be undertaken?

Mr. REID: As soon as the item is passed.

Mr. KYTE: Is it intended to extend the wharf further out into the harbour?

Mr. REID: We are going to raise and extend the wharf.

Mr. KYTE: How far is it to be extended? What is more important than raising the wharf is to have some dredging done there, so as to enable a steamer to call at the wharf. When the wharf was purchased in 1911, it was intended that the steamer which serves the southern shore of Halifax and Cape Breton should call at the wharf for the purpose of giving the residents of that important community connection with their markets east and west. Unfortunately, since the change of Government, no improvement has been made in that harbour up to the present time. Considerable dredging was done before 1911, but more is necessary at the approach to the wharf. These people are without any communication with the outside world, as the sailing vessel which used to call there was lost some years ago, and they now have to depend entirely upon a small steamer owned by a private company that operates during the lobster season between Fourchu and Louisburg. I would urge the Government to take a portion of the money which is to be voted under the head of dredging in the Maritime Provinces, and do some further dredging in the neighbourhood of the wharf, to give the people in that locality the same advantages that are enjoyed by other ports in the province. It is one of the most important fishing communities in the province of Nova Scotia, and the people are severely handicapped by having no means of exporting their fish to the markets to which fish caught in other parts of the province are shipped. I am very glad indeed to see the Government is going to extend the wharf, but they should not stop there, because extending the wharf will not be sufficient. Some dredging is absolutely necessary in order to give a sufficient depth of water to enable these steamers to call there.

Mr. REID: I see by the report that this is a very important matter for the people in that locality, as they are forty miles away from a railway, and depend entirely on one schooner to carry their fish to Halifax. I shall draw my hon. friend's statement to the attention of the officials, and will see if any dredging can be done.

Friar's Head—repairs to breakwater, $1,000.

Mr. CHISHOLM: How much has been spent on repairs to this work the last couple of years?

Mr. REID: The breakwater was built of concrete in the year 1901-03, and was 110 feet long, 4 feet on top, and 6 feet on bottom. The total expenditure to March 31, 1916, has been $3,773.76.

Mr. CHISHOLM: The engineer reported in 1911 that $2,200 or $2,500 was required to make the repairs to this breakwater. This money was provided in the general estimates of 1911 by the late government and should have been spent by the present Government if they had an honest desire to preserve this important public work; but then the Conservative party came into power and very few repairs have since been made. They would not even allow to be spent the amounts provided by the Liberal party. They permitted the work to go to destruction and decay. The destruction of the breakwater has continued right up to to-day, and I find that the same engineer now says that $1,000 will cover the repairs necessaray there. I cannot quite understand that. I know that $1,000 will not begin to do the repairs. I should like to know what particular part of the work is going to be repaired. The repairs are very necessary and should have been made long ago, in order to preserve the work already done there.

Mr. REID: The figures are as follows: 1,200 ft. B.M. scantling for forms at $30, $36; 800 ft. B.M. boards: $30, $24; 3,000 lbs. steel rods reinforcement at .06, $180; 70 cu. yds. concrete at $10, $700; add for omissions and contingencies, $60; total, $1,000.

Mr. CHISHOLM: That does not complete the work.

Mr REID: I do not think so.

Mr. CHISHOLM: It is only $1,000 out of the $3,500 that was granted in 1911 by the Liberal government. That is to say, this Government are giving only $1,000 six years after they came to power out of the $3,500 provided by the Liberal party in 1911.

Mr. REID: It is all that is being done this year.

Mr. CHISHOLM: The other $2,500 has not been spent.

Gabarus—extension of protection works, $750.

Mr. CARROLL: This is a very important fishing station. But for the protection works the fishermen of Gabarus would have great difficulty in getting their boats in and out of the harbour, if harbour you can call it. I have been in communication with the representative men of Gabarus, and I know they expected a much larger sum than this to be spent on the extension of the protection works. If it was only some small improvements that were required, $750 might be sufficient, but I think the minister will agree with me that only a very small extension can be made for that sum. The protection is required for the boats passing in and out of the harbour. The fishermen are also having difficulty with the sand filling up the channel.

Mr. REID: I understand that $250 has already been spent this year on urgent repairs. This $750 is all that it is proposed to spend during the present season.

Mr. CARROLL: What does the engineer's report say?

Mr. REID: In a report dated March 30, 1915, District Engineer Bernasconi states that the beach protection work built has proved very beneficial to the harbour, but it does not extend far enough to protect the whole of the harbour, and it is now asked that it be extended a further distance of 500 feet in a southerly direction. As the work is necessary for the protection of the harbour, he recommends its construction.

Mr. CARROLL: There is no question as to the necessity for this work, but I think $750 will scarcely build 750 feet.

Mr. REID: It will build a piece of it.

Mr. CARROLL: A very short piece. I should like the department to get a further report from the engineer. I understand that the channel is fast filling in, and that the fishermen have great difficulty in getting their boats in and out of the harbour.

Grand Mira—wharf, $1,000.

Mr. REID: This amount is required to construct a block and span wharf, 70 feet in length and 16 feet wide, with an "L" at the outer end 20 x 20 feet, and extending to 8 feet at low water, also warehouse 12 x 14 feet thereon.

Mr. CARROLL: This is a new wharf?

Mr. REID: Yes.

Mr. CARROLL: Does it say on what side of the Grand Mira river?

Mr. REID: It is asked for on Grand Mira North.

Half Island Cove—repairs to breakwater, $700.

Mr. REID: This amount is asked for by District Engineer Millidge to reconstruct the outer face of the breakwater at the inner end, estimated cost $700. The work is required to prevent further damage to the breakwater during the fall storms.

Mr. SINCLAIR: Is that amount considered sufficient to put the breakwater in good repair?

Mr. REID: That is what he reports.

Mr. SINCLAIR: Has the engineer made any report in regard to another breakwater in the locality? I understood there was an application for a breakwater on the other side, at Half Island cove.

Mr. REID: That may be, but that would be new work, and we are only taking items for repairs.

Mr. SINCLAIR: Does the minister intend to make the repairs this year?

Mr. REID: Yes, we will proceed with them immediately the vote is passed.

Mr. SINCLAIR: The wharf is in a dangerous condition at present. It is in a very exposed place, and in storms the whole sweep of the bay is breaking against it. It is in such a condition that it may not stand through the winter, if some repairs are not made to it, and I am glad to know the minister is taking some steps in regard to this wharf, as it is an important wharf for that locality. If the work is not done soon it may be all carried away.

Mr. REID. We could not proceed with it until the vote was passed. The deputy had instructions to proceed with all these works at once.

Inverness harbour—repairs and improvements, $5,500.

Mr. REID: This amount is asked for by District Engineer Bernasconi to effect the following improvements: (a) Repairs to western breakwater, $1,000; (b) Dredging the entrance channel and extending the eastern breakwater, $4,500.

Mr. CHISHOLM: Can the minister tell me what amount of work has been done? They have been doing a little work there this summer. Will the hon. gentleman tell us the nature of the work, and the amount of money already expended?

Mr. REID: We have not a record of the work that has been done this summer. I will obtain the information.

Mr. CHISHOLM: This $5,500 is for the purpose of continuing the work that has been commenced this summer?

Mr. REID: Yes.

Mr. CHISHOLM: Does the minister propose building any new structures there this fall?

Mr. REID: We will proceed with what this vote provides for. It is for repairs to western breakwater, $1,000; dredging entrance to channel and extending the eastern breakwater, $4,500. The eastern breakwater and the repairs to the western breakwater will be commenced at once. There is a little dredging in connection with that.

Mr. CHISHOLM: What is the nature of the dredging? How does the minister propose to have it done?

Mr. REID: The fishermen and inhabitants of Inverness request that a channel be dredged or excavated across the beach into McIsaac's lake, to a depth of one foot at low water spring tides, fifteen feet wide on the bottom. To dredge such a channel, fifteen feet wide on bottom to a depth of one foot at low water spring tides, would require the removal of about 4,000 cubic yards from situ, to which add 25 per cent for filling in during storms, or a total of 5,000 cubic yards.

The eastern breakwater as it now stands is 652 feet long, and the bottom, at the outer end, is about 1½ feet above low water spring tides. This breakwater should be extended out 175 feet so that when completed there will be at least one foot of water at low water spring tides at the outer end.

I would suggest that a channel, 15 feet wide on bottom, about 1,100 feet long, be excavated to a depth of one foot below low water spring tides, by horses and scrapers, and that while this work is in progress the eastern breakwater be extended 175 feet long, 15 feet wide, by building a native timber cribwork breakwater, filled with stone ballast, sheathed with native timber and covered with three-inch spruce covering.

[Mr. J. D. Reid.]

The cost of the proposed improvement is estimated at $4,500, made up as follows:

5,000 cu. yds. dredging at 30 c., $1,500; breakwater extension, 26,250 cu. ft. breakwater at 10 c., $2,625; add for omissions and contingencies, $375; estimated cost of extension, $3,000; total $4,500.

Mr. CHISHOLM: This work was undertaken seven years ago, and a very considerable amount of money was spent. A very substantial structure was built on the eastern side by creosoted timber, the intention being to open up a channel to enable schooners and steamers that ply along our coast to enter. When this Government came into power there was a considerable quantity of that creosoted timber on the eastern side, intended to be used in continuing the work then in progress, viz., the building of breakwaters on the eastern and western sides of the entrance, and if I am rightly informed that timber is covered with stones and sand and is not available without a great deal of difficulty, all the results of the indifference of this Government and their absolute neglect of public property, but I question very seriously whether the fishermen of Inverness are satisfied with a depth of one foot of water even at low tide. I do not see the sense of it for a moment. The depth of water contemplated by the original surveying was, I think, ten feet at low tide. The work was initiated with a view of having that depth of water, and all the work done by the late Government is evidence of the intention of the late Government. This is, I suppose, one of the most exposed portions of the province of Nova Scotia, and to think that a depth of one foot of water, at the expenditure the minister proposes to make there, is going to be of any lasting benefit appears silly to anybody who knows anything at all about cost. In the first place, if he contemplates doing this work this fall, after the middle of next month he can only work perhaps two or three days in a week, and the work he will accomplish to-day will be destroyed to-morrow, unless he extends that breakwater to the distance contemplated by the late Government. It will be much better to continue the original plan, get that creosoted timber the Government succeeded in losing through some official's neglect, and put it where it was intended to go first by way of extending this breakwater, which would not cost this country but a small amount compared with the buying of the useless Quebec and Saguenay railroad or many other indefensible expenditures.

When the Government have accomplished that they can go to work in a common-sense way and do the dredging but to think you are going to dredge a harbour with a couple of teams of horses and a scraper on the north shore of Inverness, is to me an evidence of the weakness and absolute lack of business qualities of the department and Government. To me it would be as sensible to throw that money in the fire as far as results are concerned. The Government cannot be serious in the handling of this harbour work at Inverness, and I am sure the engineers who advise the Government expenditure of money at the entrance of Inverness harbour in the months of October and November for the purpose of deepening the channel one foot should be inmates of a lunatic asylum, rather than in charge of government works. This is one of the most important harbours on the whole coast of Inverness or the coast of any other county east of Halifax. The town of Inverness is very prosperous, an industrial town of 3,000 souls where a first-class market is available for a quantity of our fishermen's catch, but besides that it is the northern terminus of the Inverness railroad and first-class opportunity is afforded for the fresh fish business with the markets of Canada and the United States. Off this coast we find one of the best fishing grounds in Canada, or I might say, in the world. There are great prospects there for a first-class fishing industry. I have been endeavouring to point this out to the Government for the last five years. In 1911 we had $15,000 in the estimates and a provision made in the general vote for dredging of $42,000. Had that money been spent in 1911 and 1912 we would have had established perhaps one of the finest fishing industries in Canada, and would give employment to hundreds of our industrious and ambitious young men who could earn a splendid livelihood and would place within the reach of our country the very best of food—fresh fish in the very best of condition at a reasonable price, which is so necessary at present in view of the tremendous increase in the cost of living. We all know the importance of fish to-day.

Mr. DAVIDSON: Why was it not expended in 1911?

Mr. CHISHOLM: Because the right party, the friends of the labouring men, were not in power.

Mr. DAVIDSON: I am not speaking of the expenditure made before September, 1911. Why did the party then in power leave this till October?

Mr. CHISHOLM: The fact is that the Government that was defeated in September, 1911, was carrying on the work of building the piers and had brought there a very large quantity of creosoted timber so as to be in a position to continue this work. The work was in progress in 1911 until the defeat of the late Government. When the party, which is the friend of the poor people, was in power, it continued the work until it went out. Then the friends of my hon. friend opposite came into power and they lost this timber by allowing it to be covered with sand. They did not continue the work for which the late Government provided the money, but allowed the money votes to lapse and never made any attempt to resume the work until now an election is imminent. The timber is there yet. In place of being put where the Liberal party contemplated it was going to be put, that is in the breakwaters, my hon. friends left it there and allowed the sand to cover it. It will cost almost as much to recover that timber as to buy new timber. Now, in the dying moments of this Parliament, to put in a small vote of $5,500 is, in my judgment, bordering on silliness, because they cannot accomplish anything practical with that vote so late in the season. However, as far as it goes, we will be grateful even for small favours, and if they will only expend this money in continuing the work initiated by the late Government, with a view of having substantial and lasting results, it will be continued by gentlemen opposite or by this side of the House as the country may determine in the near future. But I cannot characterize the idea of deepening the channel by one foot as anything but silliness, and a very striking exemplification of the business calibre of the present Government.

Mr. REID: The hon. gentleman is hardly right when he suggests that nothing has been done by this Government. I find that previous to 1911 a small amount had been expended each year.

Mr. CHISHOLM: Where?

Mr. REID: In 1908-09, $3,012 was expended; in 1910-11 $13,000, in 1911-12 $3,782.77, and in 1912-13, $2,596.90. Now we are going to expend more.

Mr. CHISHOLM: We had to fight Mackenzie and Mann for a number of years before we could get the land expropriated.

The vigorous and unrelenting efforts of my predecessor, the late Dr. McLennan, resulted in securing for the county the lands to enable the work to begin. When we went out of power we had all the machinery to continue this work in a vigorous way. If the Liberal party had been returned to power in 1911 they would have proceeded with this work. They provided the necessary money not only for the breakwater but for the dredging, and had secured a very considerable quantity of creosoted timber and were carrying on the work in a manner which assured a substantial structure and the creation of a satisfactory harbour for Inverness.

Irish Cove — reconstruction of wharf— $2,700.

Mr. REID: This work is recommended by the district engineer. The money is to be used to construct a new block at the outer end of the present pier 40 x 20 feet by 14 feet high. The estimated cost is $2,700.

Mr. CARROLL: Will this be done by day labour?

Mr. REID: Yes.

Mr. CARROLL: Under the supervision of the engineer?

Mr. REID: Yes.

Mr. CARROLL: When this wharf was being built we had a very capable man in that district to look after the work under the district engineer. I refer to Mr. Malcolm McNeil who lives quite near the wharf. I would recommend to the minister that before looking for anybody else to act under the supervision of the engineer he would endeavour to find out the capacity of Malcolm McNeil.

Mr. REID: I will do that.

Mr. KYTE: When did the minister receive the report from the engineer asking for this expenditure?

Mr. REID: I have not the date here.

Mr. KYTE: I think the minister will find it extremely difficult to get the work done this fall. It is rather unfortunate that these amounts were not placed in the main estimates so that the work could have been done in the early part of the season when it could have been done to advantage.

Jamesville—repairs to breakwater, $1,800.

Mr. McKENZIE: On this item I think I must have a heart to heart talk with the minister. The estimates of 1910-11 contained a very substantial amount for a breakwater at Jamesville. There is a report from the engineer on file recommending the height and depth of water at the outer end of the breakwater and the general dimensions. Before a dollar of the money was spent there was a change of Government. There is a letter in the department from Mr. McCormick, who used to be my opponent, recommending that this expenditure should not be made. It was dropped and there was nothing done. The minister will find that letter in the department. It was written some time in the fall of 1911 by my good friend Mr. McCormick. I am not finding fault with what he said. Possibly that was his judgment. But, later on, there was a local election in the county of Victoria and gentlemen from outside of the county came in and the announcement was made to the people of Jamesville that although Mr. McCormick had recommended that the breakwater should not be built, something would be done. A second report, now in the minister's department, was obtained from the same engineer recommending a very much smaller amount of money and a very inferior piece of work. They started with that expenditure and they have been doing something for the last two or three years. A frail structure was put into the water and a good deal of money was expended with the result that last fall, when a considerable southwestern breeze was blowing, the whole thing took a notion that it would not stay in the water any longer. It came ashore. The minister, if he went to Jamesville, would find it high and dry, suitable only for kindling wood, at the top of the beach. I would ask the minister to let this item stand until he brings down the reports. This is an important work and it should have been done right from the beginning. Putting this small amount of money it is merely money thrown away. If he starts with $1,800 to gather these matchwood pieces from the beach and put the structure out again it will simply come ashore. If the minister will refer to the reports in this department he will find that what I say is correct. It will be very much better to save the $1,800 and to put twice that amount in the estimates so as to provide something that will be of some benefit to the people.

Mr. REID: This vote is in accordance with the recommendation of Assistant District Engineer Cunningham. From his report it would seem that something should be done, if only to protect the present work.

Mr. McKENZIE: I am as anxious as any member to have money spent in my riding, and I never object to that; but I must, in all conscience, tell the minister that this thing is absolutely useless. The minister will find that when Mr. Bernasconi was asked to make a second report for a certain amount of money he reported that anything that could be erected for the amount specified would not stand, and what he predicted has come to pass. I would not do justice to the people of Jamesville if I was a party to the rebuilding of this disgraceful thing, which was erected for the miserable consideration of trying to get a few votes in that by-election. If this $1,800 is spent in this way it will be against my will, because after what has been put there it is practically throwing the money into the water. The only effective measure will be to begin anew and erect a proper breakwater there.

Mr. REID: The objection to striking it out is that Mr. Cunningham reports that the work is necessary to protect what is already there. I feel that we should pass the item on the understanding that no work will be done without a thorough investigation by the department, and, of course, the engineers will visit the work in their official capacity.

Mr. McKENZIE: If the minister would see the work he would understand how useless this vote is. One-half the structure came ashore, the other half has sunk beneath the waves, and it is now proposed to put something more on top of the submerged portion.

Mr. REID: If this should not be a sufficient amount to properly complete the work, we might be able to help out from the general vote. There is no desire on the part of the department to spend any money unless the engineers assure the department that the work will be permanent.

Mr. McKENZIE: The original plan is in the department, and if they build according to that there will be some good result.

Jones harbour — repairs to breakwater-wharf, $1,000.

Mr. REID: This vote is asked for by District Engineer Lock to make repairs that are absolutely urgent and necessary at this place at which there is greatly increased shipping.

L'Ardoise—repairs to breakwater, $2,600.

Mr. REID: This vote is asked for by Mr. Bernasconi to repair several bad breaks caused by windstorms.

Mr. KYTE: What is the date of that report?

Mr. REID: June, 1917.

Mr. KYTE: That is another work that cannot be done this year, as it is at one of the most exposed places on the southern coast of Cape Breton, and any work to be effective should be done early in the season.

Mr. REID: These estimates can be used until the latter part of April, so that it may be done in the spring.

Lingan—repairs to beach protection works, $650.

Mr. REID: This is asked for by the district engineer to make urgent repairs and to raise the beach protection work to the proper height, which is necessary to the permanence of this work.

Mr. CARROLL: I think I noticed last summer that much of this brush work had been washed away, or else had sunk into the sand. It has served a useful purpose, as similar work on other beaches has done. This $650, if it is sufficient, will serve a useful purpose in keeping the road intact.

5 p.m.

Malagash—repairs to wharf, $1,000.

Mr. REID: When the ice was breaking up this spring there were exceptionally heavy storms and the wharf at Malagash was considerably damaged. This is to effect the necessary repairs.

Mr. CARROLL: Were any petitions sent to the Department of Public Works from the New Waterford fishermen with regard to the necessity for some protection to enable them to do fishing there?

Mr. REID: I will make a note of that and send the hon. member a letter explaining the matter.

Mr. CARROLL: I have received letters from two or three fishermen there in regard to this matter and I told them that when the estimates were up I would bring it to the attention of the Government. I think that the department sent a man down there; I do not know what report he made as to the feasibility of establishing some kind of small harbour for the fishermen. I should like the minister also to give consideration to the matter of repairs at East Bay. If he could obtain some money from the general vote for harbours and rivers, dredging, etc., in Nova Scotia, I wish he would take the necessary steps to repair that wharf. At that place they have a

steamer service twice a week, but it is almost impossible to land anything at the East Bay wharf. I would suggest that the department get Mr. Bernasconi to make a report on the matter. They do land certain supplies there in small boats, but that operation takes a good deal of time, and the steamers have only a short time within which to make the trip.

Mr. REID: I have asked the deputy minister to read Hansard to-morrow and take note of what the hon. gentleman has said.

Margaree harbour—repairs and improvements, $18,300.

Mr. CHISHOLM: I am anxious to get a little more information on this item. Will the minister give me an idea of how this $18,300 is to be expended?

Mr. REID: The amount of $18,300 is required to make the following repairs and improvements to Margaree harbour: (a) construction of sand groin and block, $7,500; (b) repairs and strengthening of breakwater, $4,800; (c) dredging channel and entrance, $6,000; total, $18,300. The sand groin, consisting of crib work, will be 15 feet wide on top, extending seaward from the beach, a distance of 550 feet towards the outer end of the breakwater with a solid timber block with creosoted timber substructure, 30 by 30 feet, on top at its outer end; estimated cost, $7,500. During the heavy gales which visited the western coast of Cape Breton Island in December last, a section of the breakwater at Margaree was badly wrecked and in order to prevent a breach through the work it is necessary to repair and strengthen the damaged portion as soon as possible after the opening of navigation in the spring.

Mr. CHISHOLM: This programme is in line with what was suggested five years ago, as can be seen in the reports in the minister's department. That was my own suggestion after consulting my fishermen; $10,000 was appropriated for extending the wharf and breakwater, and an additional amount of $24,000 for dredging. I approve the plan that is to be acted upon; I think the only solution of our difficulties down there is the building of this crib work to the west of the harbour, running at an angle towards the end of the eastern breakwater. But I repeat that the expenditure of $4,500 this fall will do nothing more than perpetuate the conditions that have obtained there during the last five years. The minister proposes to expend this mere pittance to make a partial repair of the breakwater,

and he is going to leave that structure in such condition that it will be further damaged this winter and next spring. He cannot hope, even if he economically expended this amount of $4,800, to make proper repair of the breakwater. I want to impress upon the minister the fact that this $4,500 will not make the necessary repairs on that eastern breakwater; that is, it will not place the breakwater in the condition that it was in five years ago. The report of the engineer makes reference to the fact that a portion of that breakwater was carried away last fall. The engineer has not made a full report of the conditions in respect of the rest of the breakwater, which is gradually being destroyed. The engineer took care—I do not know why—not to explain that the portion of the breakwater carried away last fall was the work done only the fall before. The new work was carried away, and it took with it another portion of the breakwater. And I will say this, that if the engineer had consulted his foreman who did the work he would have been informed of the absurdity of the course followed by the engineer. The foreman's judgment, in my opinion, was better than the engineer's with respect to this repair work. If the minister wants anything like a proper repair of the breakwater, he must repair it in such a way that the work will be substantially done and will withstand the storms. The trouble with the work done last fall was that the spikes failed to hold because of their having been driven into old decayed wood making up that portion of the breakwater to which the new work was attached. The old work had been left gradually to fall into decay through the evident indifference of the engineer or the department, or both. In order properly to repair this breakwater, work must be begun at the bottom. If the minister proceeds as the department has proceeded during the last three or four years, he will simply furnish a number of fishermen with firewood next spring, made up of the wood that he is going to buy, at a good price, no doubt, and put into that breakwater. The expenditure of this $4,000 will accomplish no object, unless it be that of attempting to defeat me at the next election in that district. I promise him that the only way he can accomplish that is to convince the people there that he is honest in his efforts to improve this harbour, and to do this he must change his policy of granting money at a time when results cannot possibly be secured so far as our harbour conditions go,

and when there is every evidence that the work is not intended to be done. Whether he defeats me or not, the protection of our public works is of more importance to me while I represent my people in this House. It cannot be said by the Government that I have not kept the facts before them year after year; nor can it be said that the Government have made an honest effort to keep these works in good repair. I am glad that after my continued efforts I have succeeded in convincing the minister of the importance of building this western breakwater and of doing the necessary dredging, and for their action in the matter I thank the Government. I do impress upon them, however, the extent of their failure to keep up the other breakwater; it is nothing less than a crime, and I also wish to tell the minister that I am doubtful of his sincerity with regard to the expenditure of this money.

Mr. REID: This matter was brought to the attention of the Minister of Public Works early in the year by the hon. member, and, of course, it was impossible for him to do anything until he had the necessary amount placed in the Estimates and sary amount placed in the estimates and passed by Parliament. We could not do anything until now.

When the hon. member states that this item is probably put into the supplementary estimates on account of an election coming on, that is hardly a fair statement, because the minister would have had these estimates before Parliament in February or March if Parliament had not adjourned. For that reason, we were not able to go on with these estimates until now. The hon. member states that we cannot go on with this work this fall. The advantage of having this amount of $18,300 in the estimates is this, that even if we cannot do anything with this work this fall, we have the money with which to go on with the work early in the spring. We can use the amounts in these estimates up until the beginning of April, and then we can place in next year's main estimates or supplementary estimates an amount with which to continue and complete it; $18,300 is all that the department estimate they can expend during the present fiscal year. Under the circumstances, as the Minister of Public Works took this matter up when he was making up the supplementary estimates in February last, no such charge can be made against him as that this item was inserted on account of an election coming on. It was put in because there was a strong petition from the fishermen in the locality that the work should be done and because the officials of the department reported that it was absolutely necessary and urgent. The hon. member agrees with me now that this item is perfectly justifiable. The only claim he has is that the money cannot be expended during this fall. As I have said, this estimate lasts until the beginning of April, and, therefore, if the work cannot be done on account of storms in October or November, the work can be proceeded with next spring. The hon. member has no ground for his suspicion that this item is inserted for election purposes. It was put in, as he himself has admitted, on account of the actual necessity and urgency of the work.

Mr. CHISHOLM: I must admire the minister's apparent candour. He tries to convince me that he did all he could do because, forsooth, he put this item into the supplementary estimates to repair a condition that existed last year, and for the last four years, when he might, if he were sincere in his desire to repair those works, have put it into the main estimatesfl He had a year before last February to consider the main estimates, and he had plenty of time during his consideration of the main estimates, to consider these works. Had he included this item in the main estimates, he might have been expending the money this fall. The minister tries to make the committee believe that because the deputy minister inserted these items in the supplementary Estimates, he did all that he could do. I have every regard for the intelligence of hon. members of this House, and I do not believe the minister's representation can possibly make the slightest impression upon any hon. member. I am also positive that they will not make any impression upon the people whom I represent, because they are intelligent people.

Mr. REID: There is no doubt that they are intelligent people.

Mr. CHISHOLM: The minister says that the amounts in the supplementary estimates can be expended next year. The amounts, if they are included in the general estimates of next year, can be expended next year. It is quite apparent to my hon. friend that he cannot begin this work this fall, and the insertion of this item in the supplementary estimates is in order to hold out hopes to the people of Margaree that this work will be undertaken. What justifica-

tion have the people of Margaree to believe that this work is going to be undertaken next summer, particularly in view of an item of $10,000 which was put into the general estimates in 1911 and which has not been expended up to this day? When a Government, after money has been voted for a particular purpose, neglect to go on with the work, any reasonable person would expect such a Government to continue their indifference to the interest of the people. The Government are not sincere because they will not expend the money during this winter. The majority of the people of this country are convinced that another king will reign next year and that another party will be in power who will expend this money, but this Government have no intention in the world to expend it. This Government did not, during the last five years, spend money that was provided by the previous Government, so that it is not very likely, when they are inserting this item in the estimates in this slipshod manner, that they are sincere and will expend the money at this time. My conviction is that the Government do not intend to expend one cent of it.

Mr. REID: As I stated a few moments ago, the main estimates were made out in October last, and therefore—

Mr. CHISHOLM: The need for this expenditure existed six months, a year, two years before that.

Mr. REID: If that is so, I have here the report of District Engineer Bernasconi, which is dated November 22, 1916, or a couple of months after the main estimates had been completed and passed by Council and were ready to be submitted to the House. There was, therefore, no possibility of getting this item into the main estimates at that time. The matter was taken up immediately afterwards and an item placed in the supplementary estimates. The work would have been under way and probably all completed had it not been that there was an adjournment of Parliament, on account of which we could not reach the supplementary estimates. The Government are absolutely sincere in expending this money, but we have been kept here until this late date of the season so that we may possibly not be able to expend the whole amount between now and the end of the season. I am positive, however, that we can expend the amount before the end of the fiscal year, before this appropriation lapses, and it is the intention of the Government to do so. The hon. member has stated that there is no intention on the part of the Government to expend this money between now and the end of the fiscal year. I promise the hon. member that that will be done and the deputy minister has instructions, in regard to all these items, that the work is to be proceeded with at once. I take exception with the hon. member when he states that probably another king may be in power at the next session.

Mr. GRAHAM: The minister is wrong about that.

Mr. REID: I am satisfied that we shall have the same king that we have now, namely, the Right Hon. Sir Robert L. Borden, in this House with a larger majority than he has ever had.

Mr. CHISHOLM: I must say that I am not surprised at the conclusion of the minister. I would have expected no other conclusion. The sincerity in either case is questioned by me seriously. The minister, however, does not understand the conditions at Margaree. He could not do any work there in November, December, January, February, March, or April, and if he does not know that fact he should know it.

Mr. MARCIL: He does not attempt to know it.

Mr. CHISHOLM: I know that. He has repeatedly stated that the ex-Minister of Public Works could not include this item in the general estimates. I cannot for the life of me understand what he has in mind. The ex-Minister of Public Works assured me a year and one-half ago that this matter was under consideration.

Mr. MARCIL: The elections were not decided on then.

Mr. SINCLAIR: There must be something wrong with the machinery of the Government if an item that comes to their notice in November through a report from their engineer that a public work is disappearing for want of repairs cannot be included in the estimates that are placed before the House in the following January. The matter requires some explanation from the minister.

He says the report of the engineer reached the department in November, and that it was too late then to put an item in the main estimates for this year. If that is so, I must say that the main estimates are prepared very slowly indeed. This is surely not such a big book that it could

not be put together and printed in a few days. How is it that an urgent request made in November could not be provided for in the main estimates? The minister also promised some explanation why this long delay took place. He has been urged by the hon. member for Inverness, for the last five years I am told, to attend to this work, which has been going to pieces from year to year. The minister has officers down there, but nothing was done, and I think it is up to him to explain who is to blame for this condition of affairs. If it is true that this breakwater could have been repaired four or five years ago at a trifling expense of $400 or $500, and we are now asked to spend $5,500 for it, simply because of some one's neglect in the department, I think the minister ought to explain who is to blame. The responsibility should be thrown on some one.

Mr. REID: The only person I can throw it on, from the evidence I have, is engineer Bernasconi. There does not appear to be any official report earlier than November 22, 1916, but a couple of months afterwards there was a strong petition from the fishermen. I am not finding any fault with Bernasconi. Of course, I could not censure him at all. The official report I have before me shows why the repairs were not provided for before. I do not wish to throw the blame on any one. I have no doubt at all that the hon. member brought this matter to the attention of the Minister of Public Works, but that is being done every day by members, and the minister has to consider which works are the most urgently needed. Perhaps Bernasconi did not press this as hard as the hon. member thinks he should have done. Of course, the great storm just prior to Bernasconi's report damaged the breakwater much more seriously than it had been damaged before.

Mr. KNOWLES: What was the date when the council approved of the estimates?

Mr. REID: I could not say offhand.

Mr. KNOWLES: Is the minister sure it was prior to the 22nd of November, when this urgent report came in?

Mr. REID: The estimates were all made out at the end of October by the officials of the different departments, were submitted to council and approved, and then printed.

Mr. KNOWLES: If it is to be understood that the Government makes out its estimates in the month of October, and that no matter how urgent a request may come in in the meantime, no further item will be included, even if the House does not meet till the middle of January, as was the case this year, a greenhorn or layman would come to the conclusion that the Government was running its business in a very unbusinesslike way. If there is a hiatus between October and February during which no item can be added to the main estimates, the people ought to know that such is the case. On the face of it, it seems absolutely inexcusable, but there may be some technical reason to account for it.

Mr. REID: The hon. member knows that that is not in accordance with the facts. The estimates made out in October are for expenditures to commence from the 1st of April of the following year. The hon. gentleman knows that if any urgent work is required to be done before April 1 an item can be put in the supplementary estimates. He also knows that the House meets in January of every year at the latest, and sometimes in December or November, and that supplementary estimates are always brought down shortly after Parliament meets, to take care of urgent and unforeseen expenditures. The hon. member also knows that the fact of the estimates being prepared in October, and being presented to the House in January, does not delay construction on any particular work for one minute.

Mr. KNOWLES: I do not know anything of the kind. I repeat that it is a lamentable condition of affairs if the fishermen are to be deprived of this work because of this lapse of time, during which an item could have been put in the main estimates. The Government may be very busy, and no doubt is, but the Public Works Department is not and has not been; that department has been one of the snaps in public life in Canada since the war broke out, compared with the work required of the minister in ordinary times, because no new works on a large scale are being undertaken. There is no gainsaying that it is a very lame way of doing business if the minister knew in November by an official report that the need for this work was urgent, anl yet did not put an item in the estimates although Parliament did not meet till January. I am not convinced that there is not some explanation, but the explanation the minister has given so far rather convinces me that my criticism was justified. He says that the main estimates brought

down shortly after the House meets are for the expenditures commencing after the opening of the fiscal year. The fiscal year opens on April 1. What season could be more appropriate for doing this work than shortly after the 1st of April. If ever an item ought to be necessary it seems to me it is this one, and if ever delay was inexcusable it would seem to me to be in this case, where work is to be delayed until the month of September.

Mr. REID: In preparing the main and supplementary estimates this Government is simply following what has been the practice for the last thirty or forty years. The estimates have always been prepared two or three months before the House meets. Even if an item for this work had been in the estimates we could not have proceeded with the work until the main estimates had been passed by this Parliament, and that was only two weeks ago.

Mr. KNOWLES: What was the reason that the main estimates were not approved before last week?

Mr. REID: They could not be approved until they were passed, and they only passed this House ten or twelve days ago, and were then sent up to the Senate. We have had very important legislation before the House, and as it has been the custom every session, the estimates have been allowed to stand until the most important legislation is passed. The hon. gentleman knows as well as I do why the estimates are late in passing this year. We had a two months' adjournment in the spring, and we have had some very important legislation to dispose of.

Mr. KNOWLES: The minister's excuse now seems to be that the main estimates were late in passing. His explanation before was that even if an item had been in the estimates, the money would not have been available for expenditure prior to two weeks ago. Since he has hopped to that leg to stand on, I ask whose fault is it that the estimates are late, if not his own fault and the fault of the Government? If I am wrong I wish to be corrected.

As I understand it, the Government is in charge of the business of this House. The Orders of the Day are called and, and for weeks and weeks every day has been a Government day and the business that has been brought before the House is absolutely in control of the Government. If the minister will say that the Government during all those months could not bring the estimates until last week there is only one explanation, namely that they did not want them passed, because they never were obstructed. There has never been any suggestion of the minister's estimates being obstructed.

Some hon. MEMBERS: Oh, oh.

Mr. KNOWLES: If I am wrong in that, I would like to be shown wherein I am in error. The passage of the estimates has been facilitated. In contradiction of what the minister says, I remember distinctly that a large per cent of the main estimates went through without a murmur on more than one occasion. I think a sixth or a twelfth went through without a vote.

Mr. REID: The hon. gentleman states that the Government is in control of the House, and should have passed these items before. We are in control of the House, but the hon. gentleman on the other side did so much talking on the other Bills that they delayed these estimates until the present time. That is the reason of the delay in bringing down the estimates. I am not saying that the Opposition delayed the estimates. It is true we are in control, and we had to take control in order to get through. That is the whole position. We would have had these estimates before us long ago, if hon. gentlemen had not talked so much on the other Bills which came before us.

Mr. KNOWLES: I cannot allow that statement to go uncontradicted. With regard to the voting of money, hon. gentlemen on both sides have been very generous and reasonable with the Government. Without any question or hesitation or debate, on all occasions that I remember, a large fraction of the main estimates was passed. That is the fact, and once a fraction of the estimates is passed the Government can go on with the work, because Parliament is committed to the expenditure.

With regard to the other statement made by the hon. minister, I think he feels it is well to get ready for election time, the House is drawing to a close, and he makes the statement that hon. gentlemen have obstructed and talked too much. It is up to him to withdraw that statement or prove it. Hon. gentlemen have not talked more than the importance of the subjects demanded. The minister is at sea in regard to that. Can the hon. gentleman tell us any debate that was too much protracted? I think he should refrain from a general statement of that kind,

because it will not promote expedition in the passing of the estimates to make a blanket charge, without telling us to what he refers.

Mr. REID: I am not saying that there was any too much discussion on any of the items, but I say that, in the discussion on the other Bills that were submitted from time to time since May we have had very lengthy discussions; and if the hon. gentleman wanted me to give him instances I could show him in Hansard—

Mr. GRAHAM: Hansard would be against you. You would find the greatest number of pages filled by speeches of hon. gentlemen on the other side.

Mr. REID: I have gone over certain debates, and I have come to the conclusion that there was more debating than there should have been. We have a sample of it in the present debate. It is the first time there has been too much debate on any of the estimates. I am not saying that the hon. gentleman has acted unfairly, but this item has been discussed by the hon. gentleman in whose constituency the work is to be performed, and he understands the whole matter. We have had a lengthy discussion, but perhaps not too long, and now the hon. member for Moosejaw proceeds to speak on it, and he does not know anything more about it than I do, and I am just taking the statements of the deputy minister. It looks to me that the course the hon. gentleman is taking in this matter is simply for the purpose of prolonging the debate on this particular item. I may be wrong, but this is my opinion.

Mr. GRAHAM: The Minister of Customs, who is Acting Minister of Public Works, said the Government had to take control into their own hands. Does he know that when a certain Bill was being discussed in committee, up to the time the Government gave notice of closure, the Conservative members had spread out their remarks to the extent of 69 columns of Hansard, while the Liberals only consumed 50?

Mr. REID: I did not know that

Mr. GRAHAM: That is a fact.

Mr. KNOWLES: When the hon. minister said I spoke this afternoon for the purpose of obstruction, I say his statement is not correct. I stated, as a general principle, with regard to repairs, or to public facilities of any kind, if there was to be as much delay as there has been in some cases, the attention of the Government should be called to it, and the system should be reformed, so that there could be quicker provision for obtaining money, and that the Government should not be compelled to wait for the sittings of Parliament, which sometimes means that a whole year will be lost. I was not referring to this particular case, but I could refer to Inverness, if I wished, or to the place the hon. gentleman comes from. I am interested in the business management of the affairs of this country, and I think that there should be quicker provision of money, especially with Parliament sitting, in view of the fact that there has been no obstruction from this side of the House.

Mr. WRIGHT: The hon. gentleman from Moosejaw is a living example of why we are delayed here so long. The same thing would apply to a goodly number of members on the other side of the House. The hon. gentleman from Renfrew points to a certain debate, in which he said the members on this side of the House, being very considerably more in number than the members on the other side, took a little longer in actual debate than the members on the other side. I venture the assertion that the remarks of members on the other side have filled double as many pages of Hansard as the speeches by members supporting the Government. I would concede that, as they are the critics of the Government, it may be their right to talk more than members on the Government side. A certain number of members, particularly from the Maritime Provinces, occupy a considerable amount of the time of the House. I was going to suggest that we institute a little Parliament just for those Maritime Provinces, and I do not think it will be necessary to have a Hansard. Fifty per cent of the time of the House is occupied by members from those provinces by the sea. Many of the members from Ontario and the western provinces have privately discussed this matter and we feel that they unduly take up the time of the House. If all the members would insist upon their rights to be heard in this House to the same extent as some of those hon. gentlemen, we could not get through a session of this House in ten years, and I think some of those gentlemen who are accustomed to talking so much should stop and consider, for a little while, the other members representing constituencies in the Dominion of Canada, who should have something to say from time to time. We do not wish to be unreasonable

with them, and I would ask the hon. gentleman who is looking at me just now—

Mr. McKENZIE: I am much interested.

Mr. WRIGHT: —to look up Hansard, and see how many pages he has filled, and compare the number with the number of pages occupied by any member on this side of the House, and I think he will not have much criticism to offer.

Mr. McKENZIE: The hon. gentleman from Muskoka (Mr. Wright) has given us a very timely lecture, but if it takes him three years to incubate a little bit of a speech, that is not our fault. Nature does not always produce in the same way, and, as a farmer, he knows that. The farmers have hens, sheep, and horses that produce in their season, and they have not all the same manner and kind of production.

Hon. members on the other side of the House are of the same class and of the same manner of production. But you must not blame us because we are the Opposition. When my hon. friend was in Opposition I remember him well, and if he will look at Hansard of those days he will find that his planting time will be over before he can count his lines and speeches in any one year. He must remember that the side of the House on which we are makes a great deal of difference in the length of our speeches. There are certain functions and duties devolving upon the members of the Opposition. When an important measure is to be brought down the hon. member for Muskoka and his fellow-members have had an opportunity of seeing it perhaps a month before we see it. He has had an opportunity of debating and discussing it in caucus, of approaching the minister who is to bring it down, and of knowing all about it before it is brought into this House at all. Thus, to him, there is nothing new about it, but to hon. gentlemen on this side, who see it for the first time, it is altogether new. They are supposed to be the critics of the Government and the protection of the country against legislation introduced by the Government. Therefore, if we on this side take a little longer than the supporters of the Government, under the requirements of our constitution and form of government, there is a good reason for it. I can assure my hon. friend from Muskoka that there will be no reform on this side of the House while such measures as he and his Government produce are incubated and brought forth from that side.

As far as what the minister says about his estimates is concerned, I have had a great deal of experience with the Department of Public Works for the last fourteen years. My idea of what Government officials do is that they report annually to the department before the main estimates are prepared and that anything of an urgent nature contained in the report will be included in the main estimates. The minister tells us that Mr. Bernasconi reported in November last year. It would appear that the report would contain all the principal requirements of his district. The report should certainly have contained a statement with regard to the serious conditions of the harbour of Margaree. I am sure that the committee of this House would not obstruct the passing of any estimate if the minister would tell us that it was urgent. If these matters are allowed to drag along from month to month it is not the fault of the Opposition. If the minister has an estimate that he feels should be put through, all he has to do is to stand up and tell us and that estimate will go through if it is a proper one. There is one thing that I have to say about the engineers. Mr. Bernasconi is a very capable man. Perhaps he is one of the oldest engineers in Canada. He probably has three good men in his office. I would wish the minister to impose upon these gentlemen the duty to report upon the works they have to look after. It is in the interest of the country that, once money is expended by the Department of Public Works, that money should not be allowed to go to waste because of the want of proper expenditure for repairs. The responsibility of keeping these works in repair should be upon the engineers of the different districts and it should not be left to members or anybody else to report upon the condition of these works. It could be done by Mr. Bernasconi in my district.

Port Hood—reconstruction of wharf, $6,600.

Mr. CHISHOLM: What is this vote for?

Mr. REID: This amount of $6,600 is asked for by the district engineer to make repairs to the present wharf and to provide for the construction of a new block 20 x 100 feet on the southern end of the block constructed during 1914-15. The estimated cost is as follows: 40,000 cu. ft. of crib work, $4,000; clay and stone filling over old work, 2,000 yds., $1,200; superintendence, contingencies, etc., $800.

Mr. CHISHOLM: Is it the intention to put this wharf in the condition that it was in five years ago?

Mr. REID: The wharf at Port Hood is an old structure commenced by the local government of Nova Scotia during 1865 and assumed by the federal Government in 1871. The original work was extended, repaired and improved by the Department of Public Works at different times but owing to its being constructed entirely with native timber, the substructure was weakened by the ravages of the teredo and it was found impossible to keep the work in proper repair. The amount asked for is intended to complete the reconstruction of the head on new lines, by the construction of a new block 100 x 20 feet on the southern side of the head, and the filling in of the top of the old work inside of new blocks with stone and clay. This work is not only necessary to meet the requirements of the business of the locality but also to secure the stability of the new work already built.

Mr. CHISHOLM: There was an important portion of this wharf carried away by a storm some years ago.

Mr. REID: In 1912.

Mr. CHISHOLM: I suppose this is a continuation of the work undertaken three years ago in order to replace the wharf and to put it in its original condition?

Mr. REID: Yes.

Mr. CHISHOLM: Will the work be done by day labour or tender and contract?

Mr. REID: Day work.

Mr. CHISHOLM: I understand that work costing over $5,000 is done by tender and contract.

Mr. REID: The timber will cost $4,000 and the stone filling about $1,200. Most of it is for timber and material.

Mr. CHISHOLM: Why is it proposed to do it by day work?

Mr. REID: These very small repairs are generally done by day work.

Mr. CHISHOLM: Is it the intention to continue the work of closing the northern entrance of Port Hood harbour?

Mr. REID: The only plans we have in view are those indicated here.

Mr. CHISHOLM: I would like if the minister would give me some information in regard to the work of closing the entrance at Port Hood harbour.

Mr. REID: That is a work which has been under construction for a number of years, but I could not give the hon. member a statement of policy in regard to it. Of course, I am only acting minister and know nothing about it. I could not state a policy without going into the whole matter and submitting it to council.

Soldier's cove—wharf, 2,500.

Mr. McKENZIE: Why is the minister departing from his announced policy, in regard to this wharf at Soldier's cove? The ex-Minister of Public Works (Mr. Rogers) told us over and over again that no new works of this kind would be undertaken until those for which votes had been in the estimates for some years many of them when he came into office, had been constructed. But here is a new wharf that is now in the estimates for the first time.

Mr. REID: We have passed votes for new works at other points, including Grand Mira.

Mr. McKENZIE: Those are very small. The only new one of any importance was Ben Eoin, and that was dropped. There is nothing of any importance in Nova Scotia.

Mr. REID: This is urgently required. My note says that the residents are engaged in agricultural pursuits and number about 40 families, but the number of familiies here and in the surrounding district who will benefit is about 400. I feel that along this coast, where they have no railway facilities, any assistance in our power should be given.

Mr. McKENZIE: I know this place and I do not know what shipping is going there. It is not a fishing point; it is a farming community, and there is abundant wharf accommodation in the district. It is near Red island, between St. Peters and Irish cove.

At six o'clock the committee took recess.

After Recess.

The committee resumed at eight o'clock.

Mr. SINCLAIR: This item for a wharf at Soldier's cove appears to be a new vote. There was a distinct understanding with the late Minister of Public Works that the items for wharves and breakwaters that were struck from the estimates would be the first to be considered when the Government commenced the construction of new works. In my constituency a number of wharves and breakwaters were provided for

in 1911 in places where they were very much needed; the items for these were afterwards dropped from the estimates upon the assurance from the minister that they would be taken up first when new works were being considered. The minister has not given any reason why he should make a distinction in the case of Soldier's cove. I might refer him to a proposed wharf at Marie Joseph, the extension of a breakwater at Charlos' cove, a proposed wharf at Cole harbour, and a number of other public works of the same nature along the Atlantic coast in my constituency. The objection I have to this item is that it constitutes a breach of the understanding that was arrived at.

Mr. REID: We did pass one or two new items before six o'clock. It is true that the Minister of Public Works struck out many items that had been in the estimates; indeed, there were many applications for new works this year. If there had been many large items for the construction of new works, probably there would be good ground for complaint, but in view of the fact that there were no new items in the main estimates and that the items for new works in the supplementary estimates are few in number and small in amount, I think that the hon. gentleman should not object. Evidently this work was promised to the people in that locality.

Mr. McKENZIE: The minister is not well instructed as to the prospective usefulness of this proposed wharf. Perhaps he will tell us what steamers will call at that wharf after it is constructed, and what outlet it will give to the products of the farmers in that part of the country. A steamer now calls at Johnston's harbour, a few miles below the place where it is proposed to put this wharf. Why should another wharf be built within a few miles of Johnston's harbour? Moreover, the place where this wharf is to be built is not far from St. Peter's, at the end of the canal, where there is plenty of wharf accommodation. A little farther down is Irish cove, where there is a wharf. During the last fifty years nobody ever suggested or asked for a wharf at Soldier's cove. The minister admitted that it was to be the rule that no expenditure should be made until the items that had been in the estimates at the commencement of this Administration were dealt with. In a place where there is no need for it at all, we are to start in with a new work, while the needs of other places, in respect of which items have been in the estimates, are not to be considered. It is not a right thing for a minister of the Crown to make an arrangement with members of the House and then break it without any justification.

Mr. REID: Perhaps I can explain this matter better by reading a petition that has been sent to the minister setting forth the need for this work. It is as follows:

> That the erection of a wharf there would benefit not only the district of Soldier's Cove, but that also the large districts of Grand River, St. Esprit, Loch Lomond, Framboise and Salmon river would be similarly benefited.
>
> That the wheat and oats in these districts, ground last fall, were, in the opinion of the experienced miller, equal in quality to the best he had ever seen, yet, because the products of the farms have to be hauled from ten to forty miles or more at present to market, there is little ambition for greater production as the Government desires. A great deal of this drawback would be removed by the building of this wharf, and it is safe to say that in a very short time the country would be benefited in the increased production more than the cost of the wharf.
>
> That at present steamboats subsidized by one or both Governments pass within a mile of Soldier's cove without conferring any benefit whatever upon the people of those districts although they pay their portion of those subsidies.
>
> That in the districts aforementioned the building of this wharf would accommodate and benefit about 400 families.

That is the only information that I have. I think it reasonable that $2,500 should be devoted to the construction of this wharf. The amount is small; the benefit to the people would probably exceed $2,500 in one year. If these people have to haul their produce from ten to forty miles in order to ship it out, I think we should not hesitate to give them this small wharf.

Mr. McKENZIE: Nothing could be more absurd; nothing could be so absolutely without foundation, as the petition—whoever on earth wrote it—that my hon. friend has just read. The petition says that this proposed wharf would accommodate the people of Loch Lomond. The nearest wharf to Loch Lomond is Irish cove; if a man in Loch Lomond wants to ship out any produce, he can send it from Irish cove. Money was voted this evening for repairs to the wharf at that place. But this petition intimates that he will not take his goods to Irish cove. Well, in that case, he can go to Johnston's harbour, a distance of eight or ten miles from Irish cove. But, the petition says, he does not want to use the wharf at Johnston's harbour; he wants to go another eight miles up the shore until he comes to the new wharf proposed to be

built under this item at Soldier's cove. This shows how the minister can be imposed upon by ridiculous petitions. Then we are told that the people of Grand river, forsooth, would be served by this wharf. Grand river falls into the Atlantic on the southern side of the island entirely away from this place altogether. Soldier's cove is on the Bras d'Or lakes.

Mr. REID: How far is soldier's cove from Grand river?

Mr. McKENZIE: The mouth of the Grand river would be about thirty or thirty-five miles from Soldier's cove. The people of Grand river, forsooth, are going to leave their open harbour and splendid shipping accommodation on the Atlantic on the southern side of the island and pull their grain over hill and dale until they come to the Bras d'Or lakes, which they will find absolutely frozen in winter time, and they are going to camp on this new wharf at Soldier's cove until the ice breaks up in the spring. I know the conditions down there. If the proposition were that this wharf was needed in order that the people might bring in the supplies necessary for their families, there might be some reason in it, but the proposition that the wharf is required in order that grain, etc., may be hauled away in large quantities from Soldier's cove to the markets of the world, is dreamland so far as I know anything about the matter, and I know the locality very much better than the minister does. Some one has been imposing upon the department. This item is in exactly the same category as the item for the Ben Eoin wharf that was struck out this afternoon. There is a new candidate in that county, a great man for manipulations of this kind, who expects to run in the next election.

Mr. REID: What is his name?

Mr. McKENZIE: John C. Douglas.

Mr. REID: I did not know that. I should have left the item in, and then it would have been all right.

Mr. McKENZIE: He finds these wonderful places. He found this place of Ben Eoin. We have heard wonderful accounts of the condition of things on the north shore of lake Superior, where men have to be tied with ropes when they work on the railroad so that they may not fall into the lake. From the description I have of this place the conditions will be very much the same; the workmen will have to be let down with cables and pulled up with cables.

Mr. REID: Perhaps they would have to use an elevator.

Mr. McKENZIE: Yes. This new genius who has entered into the political life of Richmond county is finding those wonderful developments that can be produced by giving him here and there a few thousand dollars to be spent on day labour in order to make promises and make votes. The minister can have this item put through if he chooses. He can throw to the winds the honour of the gentleman whom he represents here, who has made a bargain with us that this sort of thing will not be done. I suppose he can secure a majority to smash all those regulations and all those matters of honour that have been agreed upon, if he wants to give Mr. Douglas some thousands of dollars to be spent on day labour and to allow him to promise in advance the wonderful things that are to be done. I cannot protest too vehemently against the voting and expenditure of public money under the present conditions of the country, and against conduct of this kind.

Mr. A. K. MACLEAN: I have not heard much of the discussion this evening about this vote for Soldier's Cove wharf, but I trust the minister will agree to drop this item. I see the Minister of Finance (Sir Thomas White) in his seat sitting close by the acting Minister of Public Works (Mr. Reid). I said this afternoon that the Minister of Finance, on several occasions during the past few months, solemnly promised Parliament that, during the war, no new public work would be undertaken if it were at all avoidable. Here is a proposal to spend a few thousand dollars in the construction of a wharf at a place at which, I am informed, it is absolutely unnecessary. I understand that efforts were made, during the last twenty-five years, to have this work done by the Government, but all governments have declined to proceed with it or to vote money for the purpose. It is true, there is but a small amount of money involved, but why should we vote even that small amount this year, under all the prevailing circumstances, in order to build this wharf? The minister should not require any argument to induce him to withdraw the appropriation. I should feel inclined to move that the item be dropped, but I hope the minister will follow the precedent which he set this afternoon in regard to another appropriation, and drop this one. There is no necessity for a wharf at this place and even if there were,

it can wait until next year. The acting minister surely would like to make a reputation for himself, while minister of this department, so as to leave a good example for the man who will later on become Minister of Public Works. Will the minister not agree to drop this item?

Mr. REID: I could not possibly agree to drop this small item. I do not know whether the hon. member was in the House when I read a petition from 400 families miles away from a railway, who say that they have agricultural products they want to take out from that place and no doubt they want to bring in supplies required for their own needs. This petition is signed by the people living in that locality. While there is no doubt at all that the former Minister of Public Works said that he would strike out items and that he did strike out of the estimates items aggregating $10,000,000, he never promised, and no minister would promise, that he would not insert any items. If that petition is correct, 400 families will be accommodated by this wharf. I believe the people who signed that petition are honest people and that they would not sign it unless the work was a necessity and should be done at once. It may be true that this matter has been neglected, that the wharf has not been built before.

Mr. A. K. MACLEAN: Wait until next year.

Mr. REID: The hon. member this afternoon wanted every item struck out in the way of repairs to and construction of wharves for the accommodation of the people of Nova Scotia; or, in other words, he was willing that all the items in connection with Nova Scotia be struck out, while he allowed all the items in connection with every other province to pass without a single word of protest.

Mr. A. K. MACLEAN: No. We have not yet reached the harbour and river items of the other provinces.

Mr. REID: The hon. member knows that we have passed all the items in the main estimates for the whole Dominion, and during the passing of all the main estimates, the hon. gentleman never raised an objection to an item in any other province, but he now says to this committee: So far as Nova Scotia is concerned, I want every single dollar of expenditure struck out of the estimates, even to the extent of $2,500 to accommodate 400 families in one district. Even though these are estimates for Nova Scotia, and I come from Ontario, I will stand by every item so far as Nova Scotia is concerned. It is not fair for the hon. member to take that position in regard to his own province. The former Minister of Public Works took it for granted that the people were honest in signing this petition; his officials reported that the wharf was required; and I, therefore, feel like standing by this item.

Mr. A. K. MACLEAN: The minister is trying to make a political speech, and that will do no good here or any where else. I will take the responsibility for the decision I took this afternoon. I was quite willing that all these items be struck out this year. I said last evening that three or four pages of estimates of this character might very well be dropped, because I think this is a time when we should restrict our public expenditure as much as possible. Does not the minister agree with that? Now he proposes building a wharf at a place where I doubt very much if it is required, and he gives us as justification a petition. Now a petition never establishes anything. I could go to the minister's own constituency and get a petition addressed to His Excellency the Governor General, signed by hundreds of my hon. friend's own constituents praying that he be removed from office.

Mr. REID: No, it would be the other way.

Mr. GRAHAM: I will guarantee that the petition will be signed, and will send you to the right people.

Mr. A. K. MACLEAN: I remember the days when my hon. friend took up considerable time of the House decrying works of this character in Nova Scotia. I have heard him repeatedly say that there was not a spot left where a wharf could be built. If there was any real necessity for this work being undertaken, the Liberal party, which was in power for fifteen years, would very likely have accomplished it. I am informed that requests for this work have been made to successive Governments by two or three people in the district, but the request was always refused by the department. If that was the policy of the department in the past, I submit that we require something more than a petition to justify this vote. Perhaps the minister will say whether any one else besides Mr. Douglas has requested this.

Mr. REID: The petition was signed by the people in that locality. They are the ones who have requested this work; it is not Mr. Douglas' petition at all.

Mr. McKENZIE: I understood the minister to say that this place was only eight miles from St. Peter's. From St. Peter's to Soldier's cove, from Soldier's cove to Johnston's harbour, and from Johnston's harbour to Irish cove—that is along the southern shore of the Bras d'Or lake—is a very sparsely settled district, and where the minister can get four hundred families in the eight miles between St. Peter's and Soldier's cove to sign this petition, I don't know. He talks about this place being so very remote from a railway. As a matter of fact, there is a railway only eight miles from St. Peter's, and that road connects with the Intercolonial. I represent a county which at its extreme northern end is 110 miles from a railway. Three-fourths of my county is more than forty miles from a railway. But there is no use my talking to the Minister of Railways about that, for he won't do anything for me. Then a little below this place is Johnston's harbour, where the boat we were speaking of calls. There is not the slightest reason for this item at all, except to put $2,500 in the hands of the minister's political friends to spend on timber and sticks, and they will promise to give fellows a day's work when the election comes on; that is all this vote is for. The county of Richmond was represented by Liberals practically for the whole fifteen years Sir Wilfrid Laurier was in power, and if there was any necessity for this work being undertaken the wharf would have been built in our time. One was built at Irish cove, and another at Johnston's harbour, and another at St. Peter's. The minister is well aware of conditions in his own part of the country, where there are farms running down to the lakes, and he knows that if there is a public wharf every eight miles or so the people are doing pretty well. It is only eight miles between Johnston's harbour and this place, and another eight miles to the canal, where there is a wharf. There is no justification whatever for the minister pressing this item through, even if we did not have the promise of the late Minister of Public Works that no new undertakings would be entered upon until financial conditions changed, and I feel confident that if that hon. gentleman (Mr. Rogers) were still in charge of the department he would have kept his word and these new items would not have been put through.

Mr. SINCLAIR: The minister does not reply, so it is pretty hard to tell what he intends to do about this matter. He has referred to a petition that was sent to him, but has made no reference to the report of the engineer. If there is any doubt as to the facts the minister should be able to find out the truth in the report of the engineer. The minister knows the usual way of dealing with a petition when it comes to the department. It is referred to the district engineer, who examines into the facts and makes a report to the minister, and I venture to say that it very often turns out that the report of the engineer is very different from the statements made in the petition. The minister has not said very much about the report of his engineer on this undertaking. My hon. friend from North Cape Breton (Mr. McKenzie) has pointed out that the district is pretty well accommodated already, and that this wharf will be so far away from the people the minister says it is intended to serve that they will use other wharves.

In explaining to the people I represent why the various items for works along the coast were struck out of the estimates, I gave the promise of the late Minister of Public Works that whenever the Government began to construct new works those items that were struck out would be gone on with first. Does the promise of the late Minister of Public Works go for nothing? Is the present Minister of Public Works not going to observe it? If new wharves are to be constructed I want to put in a claim for the wharf that was dropped in my constituency, and which accommodates three villages and a large district along the coast. I urge the minister to restore the item for a wharf at Cole harbour, because from what I know of both localities this work is much more important than the other. I should like a statement from the minister as to whether or not he intends to disregard the pledge that was given the House by the late Minister of Public Works.

Mr. REID: I should like to keep this item in, but in view of the discussion I will take this matter up with my officials and investigate it further. If we pass the item, we should then be prepared to go on with the work, if inquiry justifies it.

Mr. SINCLAIR: Will the minister let the item stand in the meantime?

Mr. REID: It is only a small item and I think we had better put it through. I don't think my hon. friend should ask me to let it stand. I may have to get a report from the engineer in that locality, and the hon. gentleman knows that, at this late

hour of the session, it would be impossible to get the report in time. I will ask the deputy to look into the matter thoroughly. After this discussion, they will not proceed with the work, and I am not going to push it. It is not the desire of the Government to expend any money where it is not really necessary. It might possibly be that they have been wrongly informed. but the discussion has brought the matter very forcibly before the department, and before I undertake the expenditure, I will take the matter up with the engineer and other members of the staff, and go into it thoroughly. I would not like to strike the item out and ascertain later, on investigation, that, in the opinion of the department, it should have been passed.

Mr. SINCLAIR: The late Minister of Public Works is sitting behind the hon. gentleman just now, and can speak in regard to the pledge given to the members when other items were struck out. If this item is to be struck out, what are you going to do about the Cole harbour item, which has been dropped?

Mr. REID: The only thing I could do would be to bring down another estimate, but we are not going to present any more estimates, so that I cannot do anything in connection with that item this session. We have brought all the items we intend to submit this session.

Mr. McKENZIE: If we are to abandon the position which the minister helped us to take, when he asked us to hold back and say nothing, as there was a strong reason for not going on with construction. What about the next item?

Sydney river—wharf at Perry Lewis, $3,300.

What are we to say about the Sydney river item, if we let the Soldier's cove item go through?

Mr. REID: The discussion brings the matter to the attention of the department, and if it is found they are not absolutely required the items will stand; but I do not think it is fair to ask us to strike out the items altogether.

Mr. SINCLAIR: We should all be treated alike.

Mr. REID: These repairs are provided for in every constituency.

Mr. McKENZIE: The hon. gentleman is wrong in saying that we are criticising the items for repairs. They are absolutely necessary, and I have no fault to find with them. Repairs have been much neglected, but repairs and new items are quite different.

Mr. REID: I was not finding fault with the hon. gentleman in regard to his criticism of items for repairs, but I wish to impress upon him that, so far as repairs and a few little items for new wharves are concerned, these are distributed in the constituencies of members on both sides of the House.

Mr. McKENZIE: The hon. minister provides for three new wharves in the same riding. The item for Ben Eoin wharf is dropped. Soldier's cove is another new item, and the wharf on Sydney river is a third item. There may be more. Why should this constituency be singled out from the others? So far as I know, there is nothing else new in the province.

Mr. REID: My hon. friend says these are all in one riding. Sydney river is in Cape Breton county, and Soldier's cove is in Richmond county.

Mr. McKENZIE: For the purpose of the next election, they are in the same constituency.

Mr. REID: I do not know.

Mr. McKENZIE: South Cape Breton and Richmond are the same riding.

Mr. GRAHAM: They are like Leeds and Brockville.

Mr. DUGALD STEWART: Leeds and Brockville are a combination of two constituencies—a double-barreled constituency.

Mr. McKENZIE: We have the same agency presenting these three items. The gentleman who is to be the candidate for South Cape Breton and Richmond is bringing pressure to bear on the department for these new items. It is not fair to the rest of us, and I am sure there should be some place where we can get a decent show from the Government. The older members, such as the hon. member from Guysborough (Mr. Sinclair) myself, and others, had items in the estimates in 1912, and they went through while this Government was in power, and when they dropped them they gave us the explanation that the revenue had dropped, and later that the war was on, and we were to let the items stand. A new candidate comes in among us, and he gets at least three new items in his riding, for the construction of brand-new works, and our old works are to be dropped and nothing to be done about them. I submit it is absolutely unfair, and not the kind of treatment

that should be meted out to gentlemen who are willing to take the hon. minister's word for it, and keep absolutely quiet. I wrote to my constituents, saying that, by reason of the falling off of revenue and other great demands on the treasury of the country, these works could not be proceeded with. Now we have a different condition of things entirely. The minister has no reports from his engineers on this matter, and that is another reason why it should be allowed to stand. It was the custom, when I had anything to do with works of this kind, when petitions were presented and letters forwarded, to send these petitions and letters to the engineer, and he would report, and the decision would depend upon his report. Why was this matter not sent to Mr. Bernasconi for report? But we have nothing but this petition, which is of the most absurd character. It says that people from Grand river have to come over thirty miles to this place for a decent wharf. The same is true in regard to Loch Lomond and other places. It accommodates a few people at Soldier's cove, but accommodates nobody else. I should like to have the minister send that petition to his engineer at North Sydney, and have a report, and if that report is favourable I will not say one word against it; but until he has something tangible I will oppose it.

Mr. SINCLAIR: What does the minister say to that proposal?

Mr. REID: I will have the petition sent back again to the engineer. I will get his report as to the necessity of this wharf before we proceed with the work. I shall have the deputy minister take up these three items, and unless, upon investigation, we find them to be urgent we will not proceed with them. No one wants to spend money if it is not necessary. But the former Minister of Public Works had a very strong petition asking for this wharf and I feel I should not be justified in striking the item out at this late stage of the session, when I should not have an opportunity to have it reinstated. Therefore, I will have to ask the committee to allow the item to stand in the Estimates on the understanding that we will make a thorough investigation before proceeding with the work.

Mr. GRAHAM: The Minister of Finance has been advertising for people of ordinary means to buy war certificates. Suppose he put an advertisement in a paper in Sydney asking for a number of men and women to buy $100 certificates in order to spend the money on these three new works, do you think he would get eighty applications? It is going to take eighty of these $100 certificates to build these three new works, which the men living in that vicinity say are not needed. The Minister of Finance is asking us to put forth every effort to secure money by the thousands, and down to a hundred and to five and ten dollars. At such a time as this, does the hon. Acting Minister of Public Works think it is fair, in view of the fact that men coming from these constituencies protest that the expenditure is not needed, that the Government should take eighty of these $100 certificates and put them into new work?

Mr. REID: The Minister of Finance, the Minister of Agriculture, and other members of this House have been urging the people to produce more.

Mr. GRAHAM: And to save.

Mr. REID: And to save. We have been urging the people to raise more agricultural products. They say: We are producing more, but we require better transportation. Then, having asked them to produce more, shall we refuse to spend $2,500?

Mr. GRAHAM: It is $8,000 for the three items.

Mr. REID: Here is one item with regard to which 400 families represent to us that they have taken the advice of the Minister of Finance and produced more. If they have produced $300,000 more in agricultural products surely we can spend $2,500 to get the products out. All over this country we are extending railway sidings and helping people, when they do produce, to get their products out. With this expenditure of $2,500—

Mr. GRAHAM: Eight thousand dollars for the three items.

Mr. REID: Yes, but the larger expenditure accommodates more families.

Mr. GRAHAM: It is not the amount particularly, although these small amounts combined form a very large sum. The members of this House who are responsible to these people tell the minister that the petition is not well founded and that several of the localities mentioned in the petition are nearer by eight miles to a wharf already constructed than they are to this point. Many of those who, the minister says will be accommodated will have to pass one wharf and some of them two. Some of

them will have to leave a wharf on the Atlantic coast and go 25 miles back to the Bras d'Or lakes. Surely a member of Parliament living in the vicinity knows what he is talking about. If I were the minister and a member for the constituency said: "Leave it out," I would leave it out so quickly that it would surprise him. But the fact is that it is a man not in this House who is urging this and you have three new items in one constituency amounting to $8,000 which the men representing that constituency in this House say are not needed. Surely the minister has every reason to strike them out, if it be not that in the political sense they are going to help somebody. In these times we have to drop that kind of thing.

Mr. REID: The hon. member (Mr. Graham) suggests that the members representing the constituency have said that it is not a necessary work. If my memory serves me, the member representing that constituency said that every work provided for in the constituency was an absolute necessity. Even the hon. member for Richmond (Mr. Kyte) did not say that this was not necessary; he said that these items were necessary. Is it fair for the hon. member (Mr. Graham) to ask me to strike out this item because members in other constituencies say it is not necessary? The hon. member is hardly fair when he says that members residing in the constituency have asked me to strike it out.

Mr. GRAHAM: Here is a member (Mr. McKenzie) who is right adjoining and he knows all about it.

Mr. REID: But that is another constituency. The member representing the constituency said that every item was a necessity.

Mr. McKENZIE: The mill to which they would send the grain is in my constituency and I am sure that I would be willing to draw grist to my own mill. If there was any grain at Johnston's harbour or at Soldier's cove across the lake, that would come out by this wharf, it would have to come to this provincial mill in my constituency and I would be very sorry to say a word against it. There are wharves at Irish cove, Johnston's harbour and St. Peter's, and I will give the minister $5 for every bushel of grain that any one ever sold at any one of these wharves that were built fifteen or twenty years ago. The statement in the petition is absolutely false although the minister may believe it in preference to my word if he likes.

Mr. SINCLAIR: It is quite clear that the minister is not going to regard the promise made by his predecessor. He is apparently willing to treat it as a "scrap of paper." The main question before the committee is: Are we going to keep faith with the members of this House when a promise of that kind is made?

I have put up with items for my constituency being struck out, on the ground that every dollar was required for other purposes. I submitted to the proposal of the late minister that these matters should lie over, with the distinct understanding that when new construction was undertaken they would have precedence of all other claims. The minister has not dealt with that point. He says this is a small item. But it is not small when you consider the promise made to the House. There is no question that promise was made; the minister does not deny it. If his only reason is that this will help some one politically, that is a very poor reason indeed at a time like this. This Government has the reputation of being very partisan, and they need to do something drastic in order to convince people that they are not thinking all the time about keeping themselves in power, and that they have some regard for the public interest. I put it to the minister that he ought to do this for the reputation of the department and for the reputation of the retiring minister, who gave us that pledge. Is he or is he not going to keep that promise? There are other similar items in the other provinces. The minister said that we had passed one already, but the fact that we passed one without any one noticing it is no reason why we should pass these items. If he can justify these items, there is no reason why he should not build a new wharf in every constituency where a Conservative candidate asks him to do so.

Mr. REID: I do not think I can add anything to what I have said. There is no danger of any more wharfs or other work being proceeded with than are provided for in the estimates. I do not think the ex-minister promised not to go on with any new work, as that would prevent his acting in cases of urgency. Nor do I think it would be fair to strike this out when the member for the constituency has agreed with the late Minister of Public Works and has said that every one of these works is necessary.

Mr. McKENZIE: This is not in Mr. Carroll's constituency now, although it will be for the election for which this vote is intended. If the minister will consult his files he will find that no one asked for this except Mr. Douglas, who is not a member but will be a candidate in this election. Have we the promise of the minister that he will obtain a report from the engineer at North Sydney and submit it to the House before proceeding with this work:

Mr. REID: I shall tell the deputy minister now to write to the engineer instructing him to investigate and see if the work is urgently required, and we will act on the report of the engineer in that district.

South Side (Donald's Head) Cape Sable Island—breakwater extension, $1,800.

Mr. REID: This is asked for by Engineer Lock. It is for an extension 40 feet long, 30 feet wide and 17 feet high to the outer end of the breakwater. It is required to enable coasting steamers to call at all times of tide.

Sydney river—wharf at Perry Lewis, $3,300.

Mr. McKENZIE: This is another stormy petrel, and if the minister gets it through to-night it will be as much as I can promise him. This is in the city of Sydney.

Mr. REID: This is for a wharf at Perry Lewis.

Mr. McKENZIE: This is practically in the city of Sydney. There is a Government wharf in the city of Sydney already. The shore of the harbour is lined with wharves. Why in the name of anything that is sensible are we going to put another Government wharf in the city of Sydney? The thing is most absurd.

9 p.m.

Mr. REID: The report I have says that Assistant Engineer McKeen says that Sydney river is a settlement on the southern arm of Sydney harbour, at the mouth of Sydney river. The site is three miles from the city of Sydney, about 500 feet below Gibbons' bridge. The settlement is the centre of a flourishing district and there are quite a number of summer cottages owned and occupied in summer by Sydney residents. The residents applied for the construction of a wharf so that steamers plying on Sydney harbour might be induced to call for passengers and farm products, etc. Then it would also be used by picnic parties. During the past years steamers carrying parties were compelled to carry a scow or scows and transfer their passengers at high tide.

Mr. McKENZIE: Three miles from Sydney! I hope there is somebody here who knows Sydney. That place is not more than a quarter of a mile from the city limits, if it is not within them. The city runs about two miles along the water front and here we have a representation that this is three miles from Sydney. There is only one solitary merchant in that vicinity and you are going to give him a wharf. The Intercolonial passes right by his door and there is a siding at Gibbons' bridge, 500 feet away. No boats pass this point, as Gibbon's bridge is the end of the harbour. This man Lewis is doing a little business up there, and if the Government build him a wharf they will find that every merchant in the city will want one also. They have just as much right to it as Perry Lewis has.

Mr. REID: The only information I have in regard to the matter is that which has been placed at my disposal by the department. In view of the statement that has been made by the hon. member, we will not proceed with the work unless, after investigating the matter, we find that the work is absolutely necessary. In view of the representations made by the department with respect to the alleged necessity for the wharf, I cannot understand how the conditions can be as the hon. member states.

Mr. McKENZIE: If the minister is going to make inquiry into the matter, he ought to inquire what steamers are to call at that wharf. The bridge across the river 500 feet further up is the end of navigation on Sydney harbour. The main post road bridge, or Gibbons bridge, and the railway bridge cross there side by side. There is no draw on the railway bridge, and I do not think there is any on Gibbons' bridge. The minister may be under the impression that quite a number of steamers pass up and down there and call at that wharf. If steamers do call, what are they going to call for? For passengers? Where are the passengers to come from? There is only one merchant there; I suppose we are going to build a wharf for him. The Intercolonial passes at his door; there is a small station at the end of Gibbon's bridge, 500 feet away. Moreover, there is a Government wharf in the city. The member for Lunenburg (Mr. D. Stewart) calls out "carried." If items affecting the county of Lunenburg were under consideration, I should have very little to say, but when the hon. member calls "carried" at this time he does not know what he is talking

about; he does not know anything about this vote. If he is here as the special agent of John C. Douglas, I can understand why he is parroting the word "carried" every time an argument is advanced from this side of the House.

Mr. D. STEWART: I was not aware that I had opened my mouth, much less said anything. On a previous occasion the hon. member accused me of interrupting him; I can assure him that I was not conscious of having interrupted him to-night. I know very little about this matter. I do know something of the locality affected by this vote, but nothing that would be of any value to the minister or to the committee. I rise merely to correct the assertion of the hon. gentleman that I interrupted him, for I had no intention of doing that.

Mr. McKENZIE: I did not say that the hon. gentleman was interrupting me; nor did I regard the remark as an interruption. But he is continually crying out "carried" when I am trying to explain to the minister the conditions in my own constituency, with which I am familiar. I do not regard it as courteous for an hon. member who knows nothing about the situation to be continually crying out "carried."

Mr. STEWART: I did not even use the word "carried." I had not opened my mouth to speak—I may have opened my mouth, but not to speak. I was not interfering with the discussion, for the reason, as the hon. gentleman says, that I know very little about the matter under consideration.

Mr. SINCLAIR: The minister has not answered the contention that this place has already sufficient accommodation. He has struck out several items in respect of works on the Atlantic coast of Nova Scotia, where there is no accommodation—places situated fifty miles from a railway, where a public wharf would afford the people their only facility for the shipment of fish, the landing of coal, etc. He appears to be willing, at the instance of the Conservative candidate, to build a wharf at a place which is close to a railway station and which has ample accommodation—a place occupied by only one merchant. I should like him to justify that if he can.

Mr. REID: The hon. gentleman, who lives in the constituency, knows the locality better than I do. Evidently the former Minister of Public Works, when he made out these estimates, considered, in view of the information before him, that this work was necessary. I feel, therefore, that rather than strike this item out we should take the matter up again with the officials at Sydney. If the statements made by the member for North Cape Breton are in accordance with the facts, we shall not go ahead with the wharf. It would be absurd to build a wharf at a place where only one man lives and where there is practically no freight. I have instructed the deputy minister to take this matter up with the engineer down there and to refer him to the statements of the member for that district. Unless he can show that the statements made are not in accordance with the facts, I would not proceed with the work.

Mr. SINCLAIR: Is it correct to say that Mr. John C. Douglas asked for this wharf?

Mr. REID: Mr. John C. Douglas has asked for work in that constituency. But, besides Mr. Douglas, other persons have made application; petitions have come in from other sources.

Mr. SINCLAIR: I do not care anything about other petitions; who asked for this work?

Mr. REID: Supposing it was Mr. Douglas—

Mr. BUREAU: Who is Mr. Douglas?

Mr. REID: He is a member of the provincial legislature; he represents the constituency in question.

Mr. BUREAU: Is he a Tory?

Mr. REID: He certainly is, so far as I know, but the fact of his being a Tory is no reason why he should not look after the interests of the constituency he represents. He is a member of the local legislature. I think, therefore, he is perfectly justified in asking for anything he thinks is absolutely required. His constituents would no doubt intercede with him in his capacity as their member and endeavour to have their requirements brought before the proper department at Ottawa.

Mr. BUREAU: Is Mr. Douglas a candidate for Parliament?

Mr. REID: He is a member of the local legislature for that constituency and has been for many years.

Mr. ROSS: Is he a candidate for the Federal Parliament?

Mr. REID: I live in Ontario, and I know only the candidates in that province. I cannot say anything as to the candidates in Nova Scotia.

Mr. ROSS: Will the minister consult the sitting member for South Cape Breton (Mr. Carroll) in regard to this expenditure?

Mr. REID: I cannot say whom the ex-Minister of Public Works consulted. I am consulting the hon. member for the constituency now and will deal with the matter afterwards.

Mr. ROSS: It is rather late now.

Mr. McKENZIE: Perhaps the minister will give us some dimensions in regard to this wharf. What is the length? What will be the depth of water at the outer end, or at the side? Has he procured the site, and how much is the site going to cost?

Mr. REID: It is proposed that this wharf shall be 100 feet in length and 20 feet in width, with an "L" on the eastern side of the outer end. The amount asked for the lot is $300.

Mr. McKENZIE: The minister did not answer the question as to the depth of water he will find at the end of those 100 feet.

Mr. REID: The plan shows that there is twelve feet three inches of water at the "L" and sixteen feet nine inches to seventeen feet six inches of water at the outer end.

Mr. SINCLAIR: At low tide?

Mr. REID: The plan does not say whether this is at high tide or at low tide. Does the hon. member know what the rise and fall of tide is there?

Mr. McKENZIE: There would not be very much tide there as it is well up the river. I wish again to point out to the minister that it is rather extraordinary for the Government to start building in Sydney river a wharf 100 feet long in order to get to the centre of the river for some depth of water when there is plenty of accommodation a little further down the river where the real harbour is. A few years ago we had a very interesting lawsuit in Sydney in which it was attempted to be proved that Sydney river was not navigable above Wentworth creek, which is about two miles nearer the harbour than the proposed site of this wharf. We now have the Government going two miles further up the river and building a wharf 100 feet long to reach the channel, as the only depth of water is in the channel of the river where it comes under the bridge. That is a most extraordinary thing to do, and the minister will find, if he will inquire into the matter that everything that I say is correct. In this city there is a very distinguished gentleman who was interested in this lawsuit, who is now chairman of the Pensions Board. I refer to Mr. Ross, who was then living in Sydney, and who will tell the minister, if he chooses to inquire, that Sydney river is not navigable beyond Wentworth creek, where his dwelling was located. I cannot too strongly protest against this expenditure.

New Brunswick—Grand Anse—repairs to breakwater $2,000.

Mr. REID: This amount is to repair the breakwater and complete groyne.

Mr. TURGEON: Is the work to be done at once?

Mr. REID: I have told the deputy minister to proceed with the work at once.

Shippigan—wharf improvements, $2,000.

Mr. REID: This amount is to close pile one or both sides of nine 25 ft. blocks of the approach of the Shippigan public wharf and the outside of the ferry landing to enable additional berths to be provided by dredging. For some time complaints have been received as to the lack of room at this wharf. The Gloucester Navigation Company's steamer, making two trips daily, has often difficulty in discharging freight and passengers for this reason, and when the fishing fleets come in to unload their catch or take in supplies every week or fortnight, the wharf is crowded. More shipping would use the wharf if there were room.

St. John harbour—extension of and repairs to Negro Point breakwater, $250,000.

Mr. REID: This amount is required towards the construction of an extension and repairs to the breakwater at Negro Point. The probable cost of the work is as follows: Negro Point—Extension of breakwater, $400,000; Negro Point—General repairs to breakwater, $15,000; total $415,000. Tenders for this work are now in. District engineer Goodspeed submitted a report estimating the cost of the proposed extension at $920,000.

Mr. CARVELL: Perhaps the minister will give some reason for launching on such an expenditure as this under present conditions. The harbour of St. John has been in existence for a great many years, 150, I suppose, and has been doing a lot of good work. Why is it necessary to start out on an expenditure of nearly $1,000,000, one quarter of which is to be called for now? The minister states that tenders have been called for; they have been advertised in the newspapers, and I presume they are now

in the department. I know the faithful in St. John who always get their hands in the public till have been very busy during the last few weeks figuring on these tenders, asking certain people to tender, and keeping other people from tendering. We have had some revelations in New Brunswick recently as to how they keep people from tendering on public works down there, and drive everybody out except those who are wanted to get the contract. I imagine the same thing is happening this time, because I have heard something of what has been going on in St. John during the past couple of weeks. Why is it necessary, with the enormous financial problems Canada has to face at the present time, to start on an expenditure of this kind at St. John?

Mr. REID: This is a protection for the new wharves that have been built at St. John. It is claimed that this protection is an urgent necessity on account of the flow of water around the new wharves. The Secretary of the St. John Board of Trade writes as follows under date March 31:

> The experiences of the past winter have so strongly emphasized the necessity for the extension of the Negrotown breakwater to Partridge Island that the council of the St. John Board of Trade has directed me to ask you whether it is the intention of your department to proceed with this work during the coming spring and summer, so that it may be ready for next winter. Not only are the new government piers endangered by the undertow which sweeps through the west channel at times, but shipping at these and other piers has been imperilled and in some instances damage has resulted.

The extension to the breakwater has been asked for by H. B. Schofield, harbour commissioner of St. John, in a letter dated July 31, 1912. Tenders for this work were only received last Monday.

Mr. CARVELL: And the gentleman who is here hopes to get the job.

Mr. REID: Well he did not get it if it is a St. John man you mean.

Mr. CARVELL: He is.

Mr. REID: They tell me an Ontario firm is likely to get it, they are the lowest tenderer, we will put it that way.

Mr. CARVELL: There is some comfort in that statement. I am very glad indeed that the gang in St. John, who have been manipulating the thing for the last three or four years, won't get their fingers in the pie this time. But while it may be an Ontario firm by name, I think you will find the patronage committee in St. John will be in it just the same. You cannot eliminate them as long as this Government continues to be run as it is. But that is not the point I am making. There is no doubt that under certain conditions it might be an advantage to have the breakwater extended; I believe it would be. But all this talk about the new wharves being undermined is simply nonsense. The new wharves are I should say about half a mile up the harbour from the point under discussion. Partridge island is out at the mouth of the harbour, and there has been a breakwater extending towards Partridge island for a great many years to keep the water from going up to the wharves. If my hon. friend has a plan, he will see that it is a long way from those wharves down to the breakwater, and much farther down to Partridge island. No doubt some silt may be drifting into the channel, and if that passage were closed up it might be of benefit to the channel. But why should the minister expend this enormous amount just now when an election is coming on? Down in New Brunswick whenever an election is coming on friends of my hon. friend always get busy. Let me give him a little illustration. An election was brought on last February and a contract was made to build a railroad. The contractors had a valid contract and agreed to build the road on certain plans and at certain schedule prices, but no tenders were called for, and no notice of the work was given. Four days after the House was dissolved in February a new agreement was promptly executed with the same contractors, by which the price of a small branch line twenty-five miles long was boosted by $76,000. The day after the contract was signed, the contractor paid $20,000 over to a gentleman named Tennant, a director of the St. John Standard and a member of the patronage committee. Two days after that Tennant cashed the cheque, and paid $20,000 to Mr. Thomas Bell, another member of the patronage committee, and a director of the St. John Standard, just a little ring that manipulates things in St. John——

Mr. LEMIEUX: The Standard Railway?

Mr. CARVELL: No, the Standard newspaper, the organ of the hon. Minister of Marine and Fisheries (Mr. Hazen). Another election is coming on, and these same gentlemen are showing the necessity of some public work, in order to get funds. They were very open about it, and paid the money over to the patronage committee, and distributed it around. Knowing as I

do what is going on in St. John, and in New Brunswick generally, and knowing the barefaced way in which they take money voted for public purposes, I cannot view this vote with anything but suspicion, based upon almost actual knowledge that an election was coming on. I do not know what the hon. member for St. John (Mr. Pugsley) may say, and do not care very much, nor do I care what the hon. Minister of Marine and Fisheries may say, but I protest against this Government entering into a quarter million dollars expenditure for election purposes in St. John under these conditions. No man need tell me it is a prime necessity to have the breakwater extended. I admit that the extension would improve the harbour of St. John. In time it should be extended. The present channel between the breakwater and Partridge island should be filled in, and it would be a great benefit to shipping; but they can handle the shipping there just as well next year as they have done for the past five years, and last year there was more tonnage out of St. John, by twenty-five or fifty per cent, than ever handled before. They are supposed to have one or two berths in commission this year that were not in commission last year. There is no doubt they require all the berths they have got, and probably more, and if my hon. friend were building wharves, I would not say anything about it, because, under present conditions, with the enormous amount of traffic going from this country across the water, and with the necessity of making the harbour of St. John as convenient as possible, and rendering all the necessary aid to the exportation of our products, and it being the terminus of the Canadian Pacific railway on the Atlantic coast, it is all right to build wharves. But when they commence to talk about the breakwater, which has been discussed since I was a boy—I can hardly remember a time when they did not talk about extending Negro Head breakwater—it looks to me so much like election campaign matter that I cannot help voting against it. The minister should consider carefully before rushing the country into an expenditure of a million dollars—it may be two million dollars; they admit a quarter of a million for a starter. I protest against it, and I believe the vote should be dropped.

Mr. PUGSLEY: Before deciding the motion of my hon. friend and before passing the vote, it would be only right that some information should be given. There is no doubt that for many years there has been an urgent demand from some quarters for the extension to Partridge island. When I was minister I had plans prepared, after consultation with those acquainted with the harbour which included two things—building the breakwater from Partridge island eastward, and filling up the gaps between the present breakwater and Partridge island. There was quite a difference of opinion at that time as to whether it was desirable to extend the breakwater or not, because the space between the breakwater and the island was used quite largely by small vessels coming into the harbour, and there was also the objection that if the breakwater were extended, and that channel filled in, the result might be to cause a current from the harbour directly outward to the Bay of Fundy; but I think, upon the whole, the people who are best qualified to judge are of the opinion that it would be desirable that the breakwater should be extended and this gap filled in. My own judgment is that the work of building the breakwater from the island is equally important, if not more important, and of course would cost very much less than I understand this work is going to cost. But there is nothing that I can say which would induce the minister to make provision for the immediate construction of the breakwater from the island eastward. The vote could not be changed to accomplish that, and, therefore, the question is, whether or not it is desirable to go on with the work. There is no doubt the condition of affairs in the harbour of St. John has been greatly changed by the dredging out of a very large area on the western side of the harbour, and I believe it is true that in times of storm there is considerable danger to shipping on the west side which it is thought would be obviated if the gaps were filled in. Would the minister tell me what is the difference between the estimated cost at the present time, certain changes having been made, and the cost under the previous plan? Plans were called for some time ago, and I believe the minister at the time was of the opinion that the cost was too great, and a change was made in the plans which, it was supposed, would greatly reduce the cost. I am rather surprised to find that the cost is going to run as high as $900,000. I was of the opinion that, with the changed conditions, it would not exceed $500,000. Having called for tenders, before asking for the vote would it not be reasonable that the minister should lay on the Table the tenders received, so that the

committee would act with a full knowledge of what is being done? If the amount is going to run into a million dollars, I would not be disposed to urge the passing of this vote, but I rather think a smaller amount could be better expended by building a breakwater from Partridge island eastward, which would protect the buoys on the western side of the harbour from eastern storms. Many people who are quite familiar with the harbour of St. John are of the opinion that the breakwater ought to be first constructed. A good deal would depend on the relative cost of the two works.

Mr. REID: I have before me the estimates the engineer in charge of the work at St. John gave to the minister.

Mr. PUGSLEY: What was the lowest tender for the work previously?

Mr. REID: I was going to say that this estimate that he gave was $400,000 for the extension of the breakwater, and general repairs to breakwater, $15,000, or $415,000, of which he wants $250,000 this year. Coming to the tenders that were called for—I suppose it is this same work—on October 7, 1914—

Mr. PUGSLEY: That was the time.

Mr. REID: There were two tenders then. The tender of the Maritime Dredging and Construction Company, the lowest, was $769,860.

Mr. PUGSLEY: That was thought to be entirely too high, and it was supposed that after the change in the plans the work could be done at much less cost.

Mr. REID: There were two tenders, the other tender being that of S. Pearson, Son & Partners, Limited (Canada), the amount being $1,233,720. The Board of Trade of St. John have been pressing for this construction. These tenders were received on Monday. They have not been laid before me in order that I might examine them. There are quite a number of tenders, but I have not seen them. The deputy minister has given me a little information.

Mr. PUGSLEY: What is the amount of the lowest one?

Mr. REID: I do not think it is fair to give out the amounts of the tenders when I have not seen them or submitted them to Council. The lowest tender is very much in excess of the lowest tender of 1914.

Mr. PUGSLEY: Very much higher?

Mr. REID: The lowest is over $700,000. In view of the statements that have been made by the hon. member for St. John (Mr. Pugsley) and the hon. member for Carleton (Mr. Carvell) to-night, I would ask that the item stand, so that I may have an opportunity of looking over the tenders and coming to some decision as to what action the department will take. The very fact that the engineer reported $400,000 and that we have got tenders at almost twice as much, is certainly one that calls for some consideration.

Mr. PUGSLEY: I think it would be well to allow the item to stand. Every large amount that is voted for any community is naturally charged up against that community in asking for other appropriations. I think it is very desirable, particularly at this time, when money is scarce, that any constituency should have the most effective work done with the appropriation that is made. I think that the minister ought to look into the matter, see what the tenders are, and then bring it to the attention of the committee.

Mr. REID: Yes, I will give the committee full information and I will bring the item up when both these hon. gentlemen are present.

Mr. PUGSLEY: I understand that under the new plan a large amount of stone is to be used and it is proposed to get that stone on Partridge island, where officials of the department were making borings. Partridge island, I understand, is owned by the city of St. John, and I suppose the city has agreed to allow the stone to be quarried there. I understand that the stone is to be cut upon the island, carried by an overhead apparatus and dropped into place in the harbour. If that is so, one would suppose that it would cost very much less than under the previous plan, and, therefore, I am greatly surprised to learn that the previous tender is exceeded by $750,000.

Mr. CARVELL: Do the present plans call for the complete filling up of the channel between the lower end of the present breakwater and Partridge island?

Mr. REID: I am informed by the deputy minister that they do call for the complete filling up of the channel.

Mr. CARVELL: So that the opening from the Bay of Fundy into the harbour will be completely filled up?

Mr. REID: Absolutely.

Mr. CARVELL: I am not an engineer and I have never gone over the ground

particularly, but it would seem to me that under ordinary conditions that would be a benefit to the harbour. What I am protesting against is embarking on a work of this kind under present conditions when it has been mooted for years and years. I can hardly remember when they did not talk of filling that channel so as to prevent the silt filling up the dredged area. I notice that my hon. friend referred to the fact that the Maritime Dredging company had tendered on this work.

Mr. REID: That was in 1914.

Mr. CARVELL: I do hope the Maritime Dredging company will not have any hand in this. If the minister does not know about the Maritime Dredging company, I might explain that it took a big part in the elections of 1911. In the Public Accounts Committee we spent three weeks talking about the Maritime Dredging company and its enormous profits. About ten days after the election I was in St. John and I saw all this crowd that had been running things go into a room in the Royal hotel and they simply took over the Maritime Dredging company and changed it from a Liberal organization to a Tory organization. Of all the raw deals that this Government has been the victim of since 1911, none could exceed the deals that have been put over by the Maritime Dredging company. There is nothing that they have not had a hand in around the city of St. John. They bought out the plant and contracts of the old Maritime Dredging company. The Conservative members of this House, and even my hon. friend the present minister, went around talking themselves red in the face before the elections about the iniquitous prices that were paid to the Maritime Dredging company, but when the new organization took charge they went right on and paid the same prices and extended their contracts; no tenders called for. There was nothing going on in St. John that they did not take a hand in for the purpose of making money. They even built wharves. And such a mess as they made of it! They had a contract to build a line of wharves and they built berth No. 17. They built a concrete wharf in the harbour of St. John. You could stand at one end and look down the line, 700 or 800 feet long, and it looked just like the waves of the sea, going three or four feet in and out. It was all level at the start, but it had no foundation and it went up and down. I was down there about a year ago and I went out on the wharf. They were taking hundreds of thousands of yards of spoil from Courtenay bay, for the dredging of which certain people had been paid a large price, and they were dumping this spoil in the middle of the wharf. When they got a certain amount of spoil in the middle of the wharf the walls began to bulge out. Then they put some hawsers across, reminding me of the way in which a farmer fastens his sled stakes with hay wire. But the "hay wire" did not hold. Yet they paid the Maritime Dredging company for putting this stuff in. If there is anything that is vicious in connection with the Public Works Department it is its connection with the Maritime Dredging company and with this whole St. John business. There never were any wharves needed worse in the whole British Empire during the last two or three years than these wharves have been. Hundreds of thousands and millions of dollars have been spent in order that this crowd in St. John might make money, and any man who knows anything about the record of this company gets a little suspicious about any further work being done in the harbour of St. John. If the minister ever decides to let this work, I suggest to him that no St. John men be connected with it, especially the St. John men who were up here in the last eight or ten days. I saw them here and I know who they are. They are the men who were in the Valley railway contracts, they are the men who handle the money, and it naturally makes one suspicious.

However, if the item is to be allowed to stand, I think I have said enough to point out to the Minister, who is new on the job, some of the pitfalls standing in his way. I have tried to put him in a position where he will be protected from his friends, and the Lord knows that if ever a man needed protection, the present minister does when dealing with certain friends in St. John.

Mr. REID: We will let the matter stand. At all events, there are not any St. John firms or men who are the lowest tenderers.

Mr. CARVELL: You want to watch very carefully.

Mr. REID: We do not want to go into a million dollar expenditure which is not necessary.

Mr. CARVELL: We thought there were no St. John men in these Valley railway contracts, but they were there. They know all the tricks of the trade. There is nothing in the way of getting inside of contracts that they do not know all about.

Mr. PUGSLEY: I think my friend from Carleton (Mr. Carvell) has been a little too broad in his remarks upon St. John men. I can assure you and the committee that we have in the city of St. John men who are as good contractors, as honourable contractors, as can be found anywhere. My hon. friend refers to the attacks made upon the old St. John Dredging company by reason of high prices. I think that when the contract was taken over it was generally recognized that the prices which the previous Government was paying were fair and reasonable. I think they were prices that everyone familiar with dredging in such a place as St. John, where the tides are very high and the difficulties considerable, regarded as fair and not too high. There is no question that the work done in connection with the wharves is justly deserving of the criticism which the hon. member for Carleton has levelled against it. There is a strong feeling in St. John that the work of building the wharves was badly done, and a great many people think that the fact of the minister having allowed dredge material to be dumped into the crib work, instead of insisting upon the cribs being filled with stone—as I think, the contract called for—was a great mistake and no doubt had a great deal to do with the subsidence or bulging of one at least of the wharves on the western side of the harbour. I trust that the minister will not for a moment hesitate to go on with his work simply because it may be undertaken by St. John contractors. All we ask is that the contract, if given, should be given to the lowest tenderer, provided he is a responsible man and puts up the necessary security. I certainly hope that the

10 p.m.

cost will not be as large as the minister intimates. I hope also that when the vote comes up again the minister will inform us of the names of the tenderers. The committee would be entitled to that, because ordinarily, when a vote is asked, the names of the tenderers are brought down. I do not suppose the minister would bring them down until he had decided whose tender was the lowest and who was entitled to the contract.

Mr. REID: I am glad the hon. member was here when the hon. member for Carleton made his remarks about St. John, because I think the censure was more on the previous Government than on this Government.

Mr. CARVELL: Oh, no.

[Mr. Carvell.]

Mr. REID: The hon. member states that the Maritime Dredging company was in existence during the term of the previous Government, and that when this Government came in the Conservatives simply took over the Maritime Dredging company.

Mr. CARVELL: Took their place, yes.

Mr. PUGSLEY: They simply bought them out and formed a new company.

Mr. CARVELL: They called it the Maritime Dredging company.

Mr. REID: What the member said was that this Government simply continued extending the contracts made by the hon. member for St. John (Mr. Pugsley) when he was Minister of Public Works.

Mr. CARVELL: So far as dredging is concerned.

Mr. REID: And these men had the contracts and were subscribing to political campaigns. The contract was made, as I understand, after tenders were called, legally called, by the member for St. John when Minister of Public Works, and this Government simply extended the contracts at the prices under the tenders called for by the hon. member for St. John. Where we have got into difficulties is by carrying out the contracts made by the member for St. John when Minister of Public Works.

Mr. PUGSLEY: Oh, no, that is not the charge. The charge is that the Maritime Dredging company extended their activities and went into all kinds of contracts outside of dredging.

Mr. REID: I understood the member to say that he blamed this Government for extending the contracts made by the hon. member while Minister of Public Works. Again we got into trouble in this way. It is complained by the member for Carleton that this work has not been done properly, that is that the contractors have built it in such a way——

Mr. CARVELL: In 1911 the Maritime Dredging company simply had a contract for dredging certain areas in the harbour of St. John, and that was the extent of their operations. When the reorganized Maritime Dredging company came into existence, they not only carried out that contract—the Minister of Public Works extended their contract without tender—but that would not have been so bad if they had not gone into wharf building. They went into all sorts of things.

Mr. REID: I suppose they were the lowest tenderers.

Mr. CARVELL: There were no tenders about it. The Government simply kicked Mike Connelly out and put them in. They put them in on a contract basis in some things, but mostly under the system of cost plus percentage. I should like to know how much they paid the Maritime Dredging company for putting the spoil in the wharf. They got paid first for the dredging, and under the dredging contract they were compelled to carry the dredge material two miles out to sea and dump it. But instead of taking it two miles out to sea, they were paid another enormous price for dumping it in these wharves, and then, when the thing commenced to spread, the Government had to turn around and pay another big price to have it taken out and have the wharf filled with proper filling. It would be interesting to know how much the Government paid the Maritime Dredging company for dredging, for dumping the spoil in the wharves, and then for taking it out again.

Mr. REID: Perhaps that is too big a matter to take up to-night.

Mr. CARVELL: I am pointing out the class of people he has to deal with in St. John and cautioning him to be very careful.

Mr. REID: We will watch them this time.

Item stands.

St. John harbour—Partridge island—rebuilding extension to low-water landing, $1,400.

Mr. REID: This is required towards the construction of a cribwork wharf filled with ballast, 224 feet long on the centre line on top and 30 feet wide on top, the basin to be dredged 12 feet below low water. The proposed wharf is to permit of landing at both high and low water. The wharf at which boats now land in low water is in exceedingly bad conditions. There is no wharf at which boats can land at low water except a small block 16 feet square. This work was asked for by Dr. Montizambert.

Quebec — Cap Chat river — improvements, $5,000.

Mr. REID: This is for the construction of a dam and the making of an excavation as a means of diverting the river back into its former channel, which it is leaving through erosion caused by the swift current of the river.

Mr. SINCLAIR: What interest is served by this proposed work?

Mr. REID: The report of the engineer is as follows:

The Public Works Department of Ottawa have constructed, extended and repaired a training pier some 750 feet long with approaches which has proved very useful and will make, when completed, at the actual outlet of the Cap Chat river one of the best and safest harbours of the coast. The provincial Government have built twice over at the outlet of the Cap Chat river a bridge over 1,000 feet long which has proved very expensive but indispensable. To-day the river, in its very erratic course, if not stopped in time, is going to prove useless the works of both Governments and to stop for an indefinite time the progress and economic development of Cap Chat and the whole neighbouring district. Both one mile above and nearly one mile below the Richardson spool wood establishment, the soft alluvial soil with under strata of sand and gravel over soft clay has been badly eaten away by the river which has left its first straight course two miles above the outlet to cut away the roadway westward and the steep hill where the roadway had to be removed some 125 and up to 200 feet above the river level, and still keeps eating away.

One mile below the Richardson Company dam the river has travelled east and northeastward and with such rapidity lately that the first heavy freshet might cut away altogether the eleven hundred feet of light soil that now separates the river from the sea and thereby leaves altogether its old channel for a new one that will carry away the best part of four neighbouring farms and affect half a dozen land owners, making useless all the works done by both Federal and Provincial Governments at the actual outlet of the Cap Chat river. Something should be done without delay and, if in any way possible, before the next freshet that, on account of the altitude of the head of the river, generally happens in June.

Mr. LEMIEUX: The facts are as represented by the minister. The current of the river at its mouth is very swift, and a large part of the land has been eaten up. If these works were not carried out, a very serious condition would result. I myself sent a petition to the department in respect to that work.

Cape Cove—repairs to pier—further amount required, $500.

Mr. LEMIEUX: This wharf is much needed for the fishermen, but the principal wharf in that district is at Percé. The Percé wharf has been broken by the sea, and it has not been repaired. Will the minister do something next year with that wharf?

Mr. REID: We will have to take it up next year. It will cost about $45,000 to do the work.

Mr. LEMIEUX: The wharf is a very useful one; it cost the department nearly $100,000.

Chicoutimi—repairs to wharf, $2,500.

Mr. LEMIEUX: I hope my hon. friend will not overlook the importance of performing certain work at Ha-Ha bay, near Chicoutimi. A big chemical pulp plant is being put up at that point by London interests. Lately they have started the construction of a large building. They are constructing also a wharf at their own expense to be used for the shipping of their products. Some dredging, however, is needed around the wharf. Last year a dredge was sent to that place but it was not suited to the work and had to leave somewhat early. I hope that this year a suitable dredge will be sent so that the work may be properly carried out.

Mr. REID: I know the place quite well. The dredge was there this spring, but the company had not proceeded with the wharf at the time, and the dredge was taken away. The department will renew the dredging and go ahead with the work when the company is ready.

Laprairie—repairs to wharf and completion of approach, $4,000.

Mr. LANCTOT: Is that the wharf at the town of Laprairie or at Côte St. Catherine?

Mr. REID: This wharf is the public structure at Laprairie and should be completed to facilitate the freight and passenger traffic from Laprairie to Montreal and other points.

Mr. LANCTOT: Is the minister aware that we have had no boat there for the last seven years, and that there is no probability of our having a boat for another twenty years, if not for a century to come? This is not the time for spending money on that wharf, and I cannot understand why the Government should ask the people of this country to spend $4,000 more on it. I move that the item be struck out.

Mr. REID: These repairs are asked for by the district engineer. Does the hon. member say that no boat has been coming to this wharf in seven years?

Mr. LANCTOT: Yes.

Mr. REID: Then we shall let the item stand until I can get further information.

Mr. LANCTOT: Is work going on at the protection wall or dyke at Laprairie?

[Mr. J. D. Reid.]

Mr. REID: I am not very familiar with the work to which the hon. member refers. I understand they are rebuilding the dyke along the roadway. Is that what the hon. member refers to?

Mr. LANCTOT: Yes.

Mr. REID: So far as I can remember, that work was let to one contractor who failed. We advertised again for tenders, and the Carleton Construction company of Ottawa took over the work. They failed, and we are now having the work done by Quinlan & Robertson. That is the firm who were recommended to proceed with this work and complete it at once.

Mr. LEMIEUX: Are they at work now?

Mr. REID: They are going to work at once. Both ends of the road have been completed, but the contractors have not proceeded with this part, and they are going to proceed with it at once. We are confiscating the $8,000 deposited by the Carleton Construction company, and we are going to have the work done by force account.

Mr. LANCTOT: This work is more urgent than the repairs to the wharf at Laprairie

Mr. REID: I am letting the item for the repairs to the Laprairie wharf stand until I can get further particulars.

Three Rivers—repairs to wharf, $9,500.

Mr. BUREAU: What wharf is to be repaired and what repairs are to be made?

Mr. REID: This revote of $9,500 is asked for by District Engineer Tourigny to complete repairs to the coal wharf at Three Rivers. He reported, on April 13, 1917, that he did not apply for the insertion of this item in the main estimates because of the policy of strict economy decided on in the Public Works Department and because there was, at that time, no immediate necessity for the execution of the work. Since then, however, a new washout has occurred, which imperils the stability of the wharf and is very prejudicial to the coal business. He, therefore, urges that the amount requested be inserted in the supplementary estimates.

Mr. BUREAU: Have plans been submitted of the work to be done? This is the wharf that was constructed by Collings & Giroux.

Mr. REID: I have the plan here.

Mr. BUREAU: An additional amount was voted to complete the work, and it seems

to be in perfect shape now. It was filled up with quicksand. That was washed out and it was refilled, branches, dirt and sand being put on the top. I do not see where the work is now required. They have been putting stone on the end of the wharf that faces the current and that meets the ice jams in the spring.

Mr. REID: We will let this item stand until I can get further particulars.

Verchères—partial reconstruction of wharf, $4,700.

Mr. L. A. LAPOINTE: The department knows that there are two wharves, both of which have been broken by the ice. Which one is to be repaired?

Mr. REID: The memorandum does not say what wharf it is. I can show the hon. member the plan. There is a stone approach from the lighthouse. Does the hon. member say that the repairs to this wharf are not required?

Mr. L. A. LAPOINTE: No, the wharf should be repaired.

Ontario—Bruce Mines—dredging, $21,000.

Mr. REID: This amount is required for the dredging of a basin in front of the Bruce Mines Trap Rock Company's wharf, to permit vessels to use the wharf, which, under existing conditions it is very difficult to do. The estimated cost is as follows: 6,500 cubic yards, class A, at $3, $19,500; 5,000 cubic yards, class B, at 30 cents, $1,500.

Mr. GRAHAM: Do other vessels stop there, besides the Bruce Mines vessels? The hon. gentleman referred to a certain company's wharf?

Mr. REID: The work is in front of the company's wharf, and all vessels stop at this wharf, so the deputy minister tells me.

Mr. GRAHAM: Who has the contract?

Mr. REID: It is not under contract yet.

Burlington channel—In full and final settlement of all claims of D. G. Stewart in connection with his contract for construction of revetment wall, $10,441.

Mr. GRAHAM: When was that contract completed?

Mr. REID: This amount is required to pay Mr. D. G. Stewart in full of claims in connection with the construction of a revetment wall at Burlington, as authorized by Order in Council of 15th May, 1917. On August 3rd, 1915, while the work was in progress, an unusually violent storm occurred, the gale reaching a velocity of 48 miles an hour. Extensive damage was done to the revetment wall. The contractor filed a claim with the Department of Public Works to be paid the sum of $18,377.43, in addition to what was paid to him under the contract. The chief engineer gives each item in this memorandum. This claim may be summarized as follows:

1. Making good damage done by the storm of August 3, 1915. This amount includes $1,064.21 for injuries to a derrick and scow...	$14,778.18
2. Change in location of cross cribs at openings, and concrete work..	1,326.25
3. Additional cost for placing talus stone in the year 1916, 2,273 cubic yards at $1 a cubic yard...	2,273.00

The auditor of the Chief Engineer's branch, after a careful examination of the contractors' books, pay-sheets, accounts, etc., covering repairs made to the damaged portion of the work, found that the total cost to the contractor for making good the damage caused by the storm amounts to $9,896.16.

Mr. GRAHAM: Would not the terms of the contract made originally include everything of that kind? When the contractor tendered for this work, did he not, as a matter of fact, take all the chances himself as to what condition should arise? It is customary where work is being done in a dangerous place for a price to be fixed accordingly, and the contractor takes all the risks of what may ensue.

Mr. REID: This was a most violent storm. The deputy tells me that where a contractor has met with a very heavy loss on account of serious storms, such as sometimes occur, the department have not taken advantage of the terms of the contract, and after they have gone into the matter thoroughly, they have paid claims of this kind.

Mr. GRAHAM: If, for example, down on the Atlantic coast, the Railway Department would do this, it would be in trouble all the time, because the work at times is very difficult on account of the storms that may arise. Contractors invariably figure on the situation, and the conditions that are likely to arise, when they make their tender. I understand a man could put in a lower tender if he did not take into account this kind of thing, if he were sure the department would come to his rescue in case a storm destroyed his plant. I think a claim of that nature has been standing for many years in the Department of Railways and

Canals, in reference to something that occurred along the coast of one of the Great Lakes, but the department contended that the contractor had taken all the risk himself, and tha other contractors had tendered higher, but that he had received it on account of his lower tender, and that when he came to add the amount of his damage to the amount of his tender, his tender would be really higher than the tender which had been rejected.

Mr. REID: The deputy tells me it was an exceptional thing. Mr. D. G. Stewart, of Ottawa, was the contractor, and I understand that where a storm of very unusual violence destroys the contractor's work and causes an enormous amount of damage, so that the contractor does not make anything out of his contract, the department have paid. And so they have decided to pay this claim.

Collingwood — harbour improvements — (revote, $72,000), $75,000.

Mr. GRAHAM: Is that a continuation of the work?

Mr. REID: The district engineer recommends the following improvements:

(a) The construction of a wharf 800 x 55, having cribwork substructure and concrete superstructure, and the dredging of a slip and turning basin at Beech street, estimated cost $196,016.86.

(b) The reconstruction in concrete of the superstructure of the west breakwater, 700 x 22, and of the east breakwater, 1,815 x 24, $200,615.

It is estimated we would spend about $72,000 of that this year. This work has not been commenced.

Mr. PARDEE: It was voted last year, and why was it not commenced?

Mr. CURRIE: It was voted for an elevator.

Mr. PARDEE: Why did they not spend it last year?

Mr. REID: Because they had not started the elevator.

Port Dover—repairs to piers—revote, $6,000.

Mr. PARDEE: Why were those piers not fixed last year?

Mr. REID: In a memorandum dated 6th June, 1917, the chief engineer states that the cost of the necessary repairs will be from $2,500 to $6,000, and that the exact amount cannot be estimated until such time as the repairs are actually commenced. Acting district engineer Stevens in a report dated May 5th, 1917, states as follows:

[Mr. Graham.]

The entrance piers to Port Dover are in a very dilapidated condition. If these piers are not to be rebuilt during the present fiscal year, it will be necessary to provide money for patching and renewing portions of the superstructure of both the east and west piers.

Port Hope—harbour improvements, $13,500.

Mr. GRAHAM: What is the explanation of that item?

Mr. REID: It is for the renewal of 100 lineal feet of the revetment wall on the west side of the harbour in front of the Brandon Shell Company's factory at $55 per foot, $5,500.

Mr. GRAHAM: Has this repair anything to do with that shell factory?

Mr. REID: No.

Mr. GRAHAM: The company has gone out of business. I understand the ferry which carries coal across the lake lands at Cobourg, and not at Port Hope.

Mr. REID: Yes.

Mr. GRAHAM: Some person told me that the ferry landed at Cobourg rather than at Port Hope, on account of the inefficiency of the harbour and poor landing at Port Hope.

Mr. REID: The Grand Trunk have their own landing at Cobourg. They have been there for years, and they never really started at Port Hope. Port Hope people were fighting for the traffic but they did not get it.

Manitoba—Little Pembina river—diversion into Pelican lake, $12,500.

Mr. GRAHAM: What is the explanation?

Mr. REID: This amount is asked for by Acting District Engineer Taylor for the construction of a small diversion dam in the Little Pembina river and the excavation of a channel with stop-log control from the Pembina river to Pelican lake, a distance of 4,500 feet.

Selkirk — shipyard, including arrears of rental and interest thereon, $7,200.

Mr. GRAHAM: What is the explanation?

Mr. REID: This amount of $7,200 is required to pay for the purchase of land which is being used as a ship yard by this department at Selkirk and is made up as follows:

Purchase of land from Mr. T. A. Burrows as per Order in Council of June 21, 1909, $5,000; rental for same: 12 yearly instalments of $140 with interest at 5 per cent (simple), $2,142—$7,142.

Mr. CARVELL: What kind of boats do they build there?

Mr. REID: This is where we lay up our dredge.

Mr. GRAHAM: Does the minister pretend to tell us that the department let the rental run for twelve years and now proposes to pay interest on it?

Mr. REID: This land was purchased by Order in Council in 1909. Mr. Burrows could not give title and that is the reason why payment is delayed. They had to pay him rent until he gave title. If they had paid for the cost of the land there would not have been interest upon it. The amount of $2,142 is less than the interest would have been on the money for that time.

Mr. GRAHAM: Why could not the rent have been paid every year?

Mr. REID: They were waiting for the title.

Mr. GRAHAM: They did not need any title to pay the rent.

Mr. REID: No, but they purchased the land and instead of settling for the interest they gave him a rental.

Mr. GRAHAM: They did not give it to him; they promised it.

Mr. REID: He was entitled to the money by that Order in Council 1909.

Mr. GRAHAM: I am pointing out the slipshod way of doing business.

Mr. REID: The deputy minister tells me it was Mr. Burrows' fault. He could not produce the title until this time. Instead of paying interest they paid him a rental.

British Columbia—Fraser river—dredging in North Arm, $100,000.

Mr. GRAHAM: This is a big item.

Mr. REID: This dredging will be 150 feet wide, carrying a depth of 10 feet at low water from the end of the present channel at Iona island to the city of New Westminster. The work is asked for in a resolution passed at a joint meeting of the South Vancouver Board of Trade and Municipal Council on April 16, 1917, and in a letter, dated May 9, 1917, from the corporation of the district of Burnaby. The object of this dredging is to give a channel 10 feet deep at low tide from Iona island to the east boundary of Burnaby to serve the industries that are situated on the north arm of the Fraser river.

Mr. CARVELL: In what way is this different from the item in connection with St. John harbour that was held up a while ago? No doubt, in ordinary times it might be of some benefit to industry in that province, but it does seem to be an inopportune time to spend nearly a quarter of a million dollars on dredging in the north arm. There is also the next item on "improvements and repairs." I do not know anything about the location and therefore I cannot discuss it intelligently, but it is going into a pretty big expenditure and it seems to be a new work. Unless there is some explanation this item should stand.

Mr. REID: It is a new work. New Westminster is growing very fast and it appears this work is necessary. However, the item is large and perhaps I had better let it stand until I get further information.

Mr. TAYLOR: This is not a new work. This is a continuation of a work commenced about four years ago and which was finished about three months ago. One contract was let for the larger part of the dredging necessary the channel being part of the entrance to the north arm. This is for a continuation of the large contract amounting to $850,000 and running up towards the city of New Westminster. The urgency which caused the board of trade and council of the two municipalities concerned to pass the resolutions referred to arose from the letting of a contract for the building of ships for the Imperial Munitions Board to a yard in South Vancouver. They realized that when they launched these ships they would not be sure of being able to float them unless the dredging under contemplation by the department were proceeded with. That is the reason why these two bodies acted together and urged on the Government the continuation of the work that has been going on for three years past.

Mr. CARVELL: Do I understand the hon. member to say that they are building ships at Vancouver, and that they require dredging at New Westminster, 14 or 15 miles away, to enable them to launch those ships?

Mr. TAYLOR: It is not at New Westminster. The location of the shipyard is at South Vancouver, four miles from the end of the present dredging, and about ten miles below New Westminster.

Mr. CARVELL: Why all this dredging if it is below the city of New Westminster?

Mr. TAYLOR: There are two channels in the Fraser river between the mouth and New Westminster. The dredging of the north arm was undertaken a few years

ago because that is the channel most commonly used by the traffic between the west coast of British Columbia and Fraser river points, the distance through the north arm being from 8 to 12 miles, according to the draught of the vessel, shorter than through the main channel into the Fraser river. Another reason is that the main river is so much exposed to storms that very serious loss occurs in the towing of booms of logs that are used in the mills on the Fraser river. Besides the reasons connected with the towing of logs, the district along the north arm of the Fraser is regarded as the main industrial location for what is known as Greater Vancouver, being away from the congestion of Vancouver city and offering very unusual facilities for industrial enterprises of all kinds. They already have two lines of railway along the shore line there but for the want of proper connection at all stages of the tide there has been great reluctance to locate industrial establishments there unless the owners of these establishments were assured of the dredging. The city of New Westminster, about fourteen years ago, obtained the services of the eminent engineer, Le Baron, who made very complete plans showing how the river might be developed. It is on these Le Baron plans that this Government plan has been prepared. As a matter of fact, the work was promised by the late Government but only put into effect since the last general election. It is part of a well designed and well considered plan made by Engineer Le Baron so long ago as 1904, and has been part of the fixed policy of the two Governments from that time until the present.

Mr. CARVELL: My hon. friend's explanation does not sound as well in Parliament as, perhaps, it would in his newspaper.

Mr. TAYLOR: So keenly interested are the people of the district in this matter that, on a recent occasion, when the candidate of the hon. gentleman's party for the district bordering on the north arm returned to that district from Ottawa, he announced in Vancouver, as one of the triumphs of his visit to Ottawa, that he had called at the Public Works Department and there secured an appropriation of $100,000 for this dredging, which was so necessary to his constituency.

Mr. GRAHAM: What is the candidate's name?

Mr. TAYLOR: C. E. Macdonald.

[Mr. Taylor.]

Mr. GRAHAM: He is on the food controller's staff?

Mr. TAYLOR: He says so.

Mr. CARVELL: My hon. friend has given another reason why this should not go through, because if a Grit politician can come down to Ottawa and pull off a stunt like this it seems to me the matter is open to very grave suspicion. I have no doubt that ultimately this work ought to be done. Would the hon. member state as a fact that vessels could not be launched and taken to the Fraser river without this dredging? We get suspicious sometimes when we hear these loyal reasons given for certain things. I do not think the hon. member would go so far as to say that the Imperial Munitions Board has been foolish enough to let a contract for the building of a ship in a yard from which it cannot be taken to deep water.

Mr. TAYLOR: I said that was the occasion of the resolutions of the two councils mentioned by the minister. The firm in question was Harrison & Lamont. In addition to moving the councils, they sent me a very urgent telegram. I do not know either of these gentlemen, but as one of the two members interested, my district being on one side of the channel and Vancouver on the other, they urged me to do what I could for this dredging.

Mr. CARVELL: No doubt hon. members supporting the Government have received urgent requests from all over Canada, and quite proper ones. I am not finding any fault with the expenditure of public money on public works, but I do not think I have to go over again the very very serious financial problems we are facing in Canada at the present time. If I can believe what I am told, that the problems are so serious that it is a question whether Canada will be able to carry on her full duty in this war, on account of financial matters—I am not going into that part of it, it would not be right to do so.

Mr. CURRIE: You could not help but say a mean thing about it, could you?

Mr. CARVELL: What has got wrong with the hon. member?

Mr. PARDEE: He is crazy.

Mr. CARVELL: Oh no, he is not crazy; he is just devilish. He has these fits every once in a while, and when they come on him it is like a brainstorm.

Mr. CURRIE: Not at all.

Mr. CARVELL: It is not craziness, it is a brainstorm, and he is not responsible for a short time. But the brainstorm passes away, and after a while he is a very genial fellow. I was pointing out that the financial affairs of this country were serious, and I do not think we are justified in making an expenditure of a quarter of a million dollars on the ground that it would be of benefit to the locality, as I believe it would. It is just like the expenditure in my own province. While I believe it would be of great benefit and should be carried out, I do not think this is the time for it.

Mr. TAYLOR: The item before us is not for a quarter of a million. The next item item is different. That is the main channel.

Mr. CARVELL: I am not finding the fault that it would not be a great improvement if carried out, but it does seem to be that, under present conditions and under the policy that has been laid down by the Government, this item should be dropped, and we should not go on with a work of this kind, because if we spend $100,000 this year it will develop into $200,000 or $300,000 next year, and so on.

Mr. GRAHAM: I agree with the hon. member for New Westminster (Mr. Taylor) that these items are not identical. There are certain lands along the north arm that would become valuable for industries if this dredging were done and a good channel put through there. The next item is for the main channel which is used all the time and stands in a different position from this particular item of $100,000, which I think might well stand for further investigation. The item in reference to the main channel is in a different position. Any necessary repairs to that channel ought to be made.

Mr. TAYLOR: What will the hon. gentleman say to Mr. Macdonald?

Mr. GRAHAM: He did not communicate with me on the subject. If I get into the Government I will have my answer ready.

Mr. REID: I was at this place and I really think that this main channel work is one that must be carried on. Perhaps I can get some more information about this other item, and let the $100,000 item stand.

Item stands.

Revelstoke—extension of wing dam, $20,000.

Mr. REID: This is asked for by District Engineer Ford to build an extension to the wing dam to divert the main current from flowing over against the wharf, threatening its destruction.

Resolution stands.

Dredging in the provinces of Ontario, Quebec—further amount required, $50,000.
British Columbia—further amount required, $100,000.

Mr. GRAHAM: Are these items taken every year in addition to the specific items?

Mr. REID: This is required in addition to the amount in the main estimates to carry out dredging at various places in these provinces.

Mr. CARVELL: Are these amounts for dredging required to finish up present contracts?

Mr. REID: We have plants in all the provinces; this is to carry on the work of the dredges that are being used. Many dredges have been laid up during the last year or two.

Mr. GRAHAM: Do you intend to keep all the dredges busy?

Mr. REID: No.

Mr. PARDEE: Are there any dredges along the river St. Clair that are not being used at present and that are available for small works?

Mr. REID: The deputy tells me that there is one in that district.

Mr. PARDEE: Is there one near Chatham?

Mr. REID: Yes, I think there is one there not in operation.

Slides and booms—Gatineau river—new boom, $11,000.

Mr. CARVELL: Will the minister explain this item?

Mr. REID: The present boom has been in use since its construction in 1874. After a long service of over forty-two years, it is not to be depended upon to the same extent as in the past. Each additional season that the old boom is used, the risk will be increased. Some of the timbers are decayed, especially on their outer surface. Others appear to be sound, but altogether the boom shows evidence of having been subjected to severe strain.

Mr. CARVELL: Is it possible that the federal Government is providing booms for lumbermen?

Mr. REID: The Public Works Department have always provided booms on the

Saguenay, the St. Maurice and the Gatineau rivers. They charge tolls; quite a large revenue comes from the lumber men in respect of these booms.

Mr. CARVELL: Even though this practice has been followed for forty-two years, surely it is time for the Government to ask the lumbermen to look after their own booms. I do not understand upon what principle the Government of Canada should build booms for lumbermen on the Gatineau, the St. Maurice or any other river.

Mr. REID: This boom was built many years ago. These works were started to help the lumber trade; they have been carried on ever since; there has been no change.

Roads and bridges—new bridge to replace present Union bridge over Ottawa river between Ottawa and Hull, $120,000.

Mr. REID: This amount is required to replace the present steel span bridge over the Ottawa river, between Ottawa and Hull.

Mr. GRAHAM: Where is this bridge?

Mr. REID: Between Booth's and Eddy's.

Mr. GRAHAM: Does the Dominion Government build the bridge in its entirety?

Mr. REID: Yes. It is an interprovincial bridge; it was built in 1889 by the Dominion Government.

Mr. GRAHAM: The Dominion Government does not build all interprovincial bridges.

Mr. REID: They built this one, and now we have to rebuild it.

Mr. CARVELL: Does the Dominion Government charge the Street Railway company anything for the use of the bridge?

Mr. REID: No.

Mr. CARVELL: It is a great thing to live in Ottawa.

Mr. GRAHAM: It is news to me if the Federal Government builds any of these bridges in their entirety. It is very rarely that the Federal Government give aid to an entirely provincial scheme, although it has done so under exceptional circumstances. The Federal Parliament has quite frequently granted aid to interprovincial bridges, but here is a case where both provinces are relieved and the federal authority assumes the entire responsibility. If Ottawa and vicinity were made a federal district, as has been suggested, the federal authority would be expected to do this work. But, unless there is some arrangement between the province and the federal authority, I cannot see why this Parliament should be asked to pay the entire cost of a bridge between the two provinces.

Mr. REID: I agree with the hon. gentleman that, this being an interprovincial bridge, the provinces of Quebec and Ontario should pay for it, assisted, perhaps, by the Dominion Government.

Mr. PARDEE: Does this amount cover the whole cost?

Mr. REID: Yes. The engineer condemns the bridge, and it is necessary to proceed with a renewal of it at once.

Mr. GRAHAM: Will the minister make inquiry, and when his estimates come up again give us an explanation of his? This is establishing a precedent; if we build an interprovincial bridge here we could build one elsewhere

Mr. REID: I will get the explanation for my hon. friend.

Progress reported.

On motion of Hon. Mr. Reid, the House adjourned at 11.20 p.m.

Wednesday, September 5, 1917.

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

QUESTIONS.

[Questions answered orally are indicated by asterisks.]

MOTOR BOAT ALASE.

Mr. A. K. MACLEAN:

1. Was a steamer or motor boat, called the Alafe, purchased by the Government of Canada from any person or persons at Halifax, N.S.?
2. If so, from whom, when was she purchased, and what was the price paid therefor?

Mr. HAZEN: This question refers to a motor boat called the Alafe. No such motor boat was purchased by the department, but a motor boat called the Alase was purchased by the department, and I am answering the question on the presumption that that is the boat to which the hon. member refers. Motor launch Alase was purchased at Halifax from Messrs. McInnes, Mellish, Fulton and Kenny, in June 1917,, for $10,000.

DYNAMITING OUTRAGES.

Mr. ETHIER:

1. Has the Government been informed of the attempt against the property of one Gedeon

Bigras, of Ste. Scholastique, county of Two Mountains, by means of dynamite on the 14th of August?

2. If so, has the Government taken necessary measures to prevent any such future attempts?

3. Is it true that the Government has offered a reward of $5,000 to any one who will give information necessary for the arrest of the dynamiters of the property of Lord Athelston-Graham at Cartierville?

4. If so, has the Government any intention of acting in the same manner in order to protect the property of an ordinary citizen as well as that of a millionaire, or lord, such as Lord Athelston?

Mr. DOHERTY:

1. The Government was not informed, but the police officers learned of the attempt through the newspapers.

2. Mr. Bigras was communicated with, but as he did not desire any investigation, having reason to believe he knew who was responsible, no action was taken.

3. Yes.

4. The action of the Government in such matters must be and is governed by considerations of what the public interest requires, and not of the personality or position of individuals affected.

BRIGADIER-GENERAL W. S. HUGHES.

Mr. PROULX:

1. Where is Colonel W. S. Hughes, Inspector of Penitentiaries for Canada, now located, and what duties is he now performing?

2. Is he still drawing his salary of $3,800 as Inspector of Penitentiaries, while engaged in military service?

Mr. DOHERTY:

1. Brig.-General W. S. Hughes is at present serving with the Canadian Expeditionary Force overseas.

2. Yes, under the Order in Council in force at the time he joined the overseas forces.

IMMIGRATION AGENTS.

Mr. EDWARDS:

1. How many immigration agents were employed by Canada in the United States during the last fiscal year?

2. How much money was paid to said agents in salary and expenses, respectively, and how many immigrants came to Canada as a result of their efforts?

3. How many clergymen, priests or ministers of the gospel were employed as immigration agents during the last fiscal year, to what religious denominations did they respectively belong, and how much was paid to each in salaries and expenses?

Mr. ROCHE:

1. Thirty-two.

2. Salaries, $51,352.89; expenses, $112,042.94; immigration, 61,389.

3. Seven; Roman Catholics:

	Salary.	Expenses.
1.	600.00	$1,549.77
2.	1,200.00	1,636.41
3.	341.67	513.67
4.	———	160.39
5.	600.00	1,027.29
6.	500.00	1,466.38
7.	236.67	888.15

CAPE BRETON RECRUITING OFFICERS.

Mr. CARROLL:

1. Who were the recruiting officers employed for recruiting purposes in the four counties of Cape Breton since August, 1914, to date?

2. What was the amount paid to each of these officers individually, for his service as recruiting officer?

3. Is there a recruiting officer (or officers) at present in Cape Breton? If so, what is his or their name and address or addresses?

4. What remuneration is being paid, and to whom, for recruiting services at the present time?

Sir EDWARD KEMP:

1 and 2. Captain E. W. Florence, $1,118.25; Lieut. W. L. Chirgwin, $1,111.50; Sergt. A. D. Johnstone, $396.10; Dr. C. E. McMillan, $546; J. F. Blagdon, none; Dr. B. A. LeBlanc, none; Rev. A. Murray, $348; Lieut. W. N. Yetman, $504.30.

3. Yes. Capt. Rev. A. Murray, from September 1, 1915, to January 1, 1916; since that date without pay. Lieut. W. N. Yetman, headquarters at Sydney, May 1, 1917, and still acting.

4. Lieut. W. N. Yetman—$4.10 per diem.

MRS. JESSIE MACDONALD.

Mr. CARROLL:

1. Is Mrs. Jessie Macdonald, of Catalone, Cape Breton County, in receipt of separation allowance?

2. If so, for what reason or reasons is she entitled to same?

Sir EDWARD KEMP:

1. Yes.

2. She is entitled to separation allowance until her pension has been granted or disallowed.

DORCHESTER COUNTY RAILWAY.

Mr. DELISLE:

1. Is it the intention of the Government to construct a railway in the county of Dorchester, across the parishes of Frampton, St. Odilon de Crambourne and St. Leon de Standon?

2. If so, when will the work be commenced?

Mr. COCHRANE: The intention of the Government in this matter will be announced in due course.

LIEUTENANT R. J. MOFFAT.

Mr. J. J. HUGHES:

What were the expenses of Lieutenant R. J. Moffat while stationed in Summerside, P.E.I., in

connection with or as Supply Officer of the 105th Battalion?

Sir EDWARD KEMP: $10.

STEAMER C. E. TANNER.

Mr. PROULX:

1. Was the steamer, or motor boat, called the C. E. Tanner purchased by the Naval Department at Halifax?
2. If so, from whom was this boat purchased, and when?
3. What was the price paid for said steamer?
4. If chartered, what is the price paid for this boat per day?

Mr. HAZEN:

1. No.
2 and 3. Answered by No. 1.
4. It is understood that the C. E. Tanner is being utilized by Imperial Government officers in Canada.

QUESTION PASSED AS ORDER FOR RETURN.

Mr. CARROLL:

1. Who were the medical examiners appointed by the Minister of Militia in the county of Cape Breton to examine recruits since the 4th of August, 1914?
2. How many recruits were examined by these medical officers?
3. What amount was paid to each such officer for his services?

UNOPPOSED MOTION FOR PAPERS.

Mr. Chisholm.—For a copy of all correspondence, letters, telegrams, petitions, etc., in any way referring to an application for a public wharf at Chimney Corners, Inverness County, N.S.

NOTICES OF MOTION FOR PRODUCTION OF PAPERS.

On the Notices of Motion:

Mr. KYTE:

For a return giving the names, rank, pay, nature and date of employment and previous service of (a) all officers employed in or connected with the Naval Service at Halifax, including patrol Service; (b) all civilians appointed since November, 1911. Also giving a list of the number, names and rate of pay of returned soldiers or sailors included in (a).

Mr. KYTE:

For a return showing the names, rank, pay, nature, and date of employment and previous service of, (a) all officers employed in or connected with the Naval Service at Sydney, N.S., including patrol service; and (b) the number, names and rate of pay of returned soldiers or sailors included in the above service.

Mr. KYTE: I would be willing to amend these orders so as to limit the information desired to the names of the officers who are employed. I think that would very materially reduce the work necessary to prepare the returns.

Mr. HAZEN: I presume that would meet the difficulty, although I am not quite sure. Perhaps the hon. gentleman had better let the matter stand until to-morrow, and I will ascertain from the department if that will meet the difficulty.

Notices of motion stand.

CANADIAN AVIATION FUND.

In the Orders of the Day:

Hon. FRANK OLIVER (Edmonton): Have the Government knowledge of the fact that Col. W. H. Merritt, who purports to be secretary of the Canadian Aviation Fund, is collecting or attempting to collect money for the purchase of aeroplanes. The object of the Canadian Aviation Fund is to give help to the firing line by means of trained aviators and aeroplanes. The cost of a machine is $7,600. If the Government have knowledge of Col. W. H. Merritt's operations, have those operations their approval?

Sir GEORGE FOSTER: So far as I am informed, the Government have no knowledge of what operations Col. Merritt is carrying on, but inquiry will be made, and my hon. friend will receive an answer, if not to-morrow, as soon as possible thereafter.

SUPPLY.

House again in Committee of Supply, Mr. Rainville in the Chair.

Cape Breton telegraph system—branch telegraph line from Washabuck wharf to McKay's Point, $420.

Mr. PUGSLEY: What is the cause of the sudden demand for assistance to the telephone system?

Mr. REID: I do not know that there is any increased demand this year. There are items in the estimates for small extensions of the telephone system owned by the Government in different parts of the country, and there will be small expenditures at the different places named. This is simply an extension of three miles of line at this particular point. The superintendent recommended it, and that is why it is being put in.

Mr. McKENZIE: This little extension is in my riding, and I should like to know something about it. Can the minister tell me which office it is connected with, starting from Washabuck wharf?

Mr. REID: There is a telephone line at present from Washabuck bridge to Washabuck Centre. It is intended to extend this line from Washabuck Centre to McKay's Point, three miles.

Mr. McKENZIE: Where are you going to make the terminus?

Mr. REID: At McKay's point.

Mr. McKENZIE: Will these be telephone or telegraph offices?

Mr. REID: It is a telephone system.

Mr. McKENZIE: Are the telephones used anywhere else on the system in the county of Victoria?

Mr. REID: They are mostly telegraph lines in that county.

Sir SAM HUGHES: Is it the policy of the Government to build telephones throughout the country, and why is the Government doing it?

Mr. REID: The Government has a telephone system in different parts of Canada.

Sir SAM HUGHES: Why?

Mr. REID: We have had telephones for many years in certain parts of the country, and this is simply an extension.

Sir SAM HUGHES: I suppose the system is general through all parts of Canada?

Mr. McKENZIE: Can the hon. minister tell me what communication can be obtained by the telephone system in this county, except for those three miles, which are not connected with the town in any way? How will the system be connected up? The whole of the rest of the system all through the county is a Government telegraph line. It is a telegraph line from Orangedale down to Washabuck Centre. The minister tells us he is going to extend that system three miles further down the line, and it is going to be a telephone system. The lines will be no use unless they connect up with some outside system, or connect somewhere with telephones.

Mr. REID: I understand in these districts the telephone system is used at the present time, but the tendency is to change the system, and have a telephone line instead of the telegraph, and, to my mind, that would be more advantageous. But the hon. gentleman can see that, if you have the telephone, you can get the advantage of the telegraph system by telephoning your message to the telegraph office, and asking them to forward it.

Mr. McKENZIE: If the minister will train somebody at that place in the use of the telegraph system, until they get a telephone system established, it would be an advantage. Anybody can use the telephone, but many people cannot operate the telegraph.

Mr. CARVELL: The minister has not properly answered the question asked by my hon. friend from Victoria-Haliburton. It seems to me, after looking over two or three pages of the supplementary estimates, that we are raising a pretty big question. Is the Dominion Government going to establish a telephone system all over Canada, or not? I think that question should be answered. This little transaction only involves an expenditure of $420, they have already a telegraph line to Washabuck, and they are extending a wire, to be used as a telephone wire a distance of three miles, which is not very serious, but you are establishing a principle. I do not know much about the thing locally, but I do know there is as fine a telephone system in the province of Nova Scotia as can be found in Canada. They have some sort of a municipal system, and their rates are reasonable. Here we find five or six different instances in which the Government is going into the telephone business in the province of Nova Scotia. I think we should have some policy laid down by the minister, in order that we may know what we are to look forward to. The minister knows very well that if the Government is going into competition with the telephone company one of two things will happen, either the Government will have to buy out the telephone companies, or the companies will have to go to the wall.

Mr. REID: This particular locality is covered at the present time by a telegraphic system. There are no telephons. The extension we are now providing for is a three mile extension to a system which has been in existence for many years. As I understand it, this line is not in competition with any other telephone system in that locality. In British Columbia and in some parts of the province of Quebec where they have no privately-owned telephone systems, the Government has provided telegraphie communication for the people. In my opinion it is necessary that those systems should be changed as quickly as possible, for the reason that it is very difficult to get telegraph operators because of the small rate of pay. It is much easier

to get operators to handle a telephone system.

Sir SAM HUGHES: The reason I asked the question was that there are certain areas in Canada which have no communication with the outside world. If the Government proposes adopting the principle of providing telegraphic and telephonic communication in one part of the country, it is only fair that every section of our great Dominion should have the same privilege. In some of the sparsely settled parts of the riding I have the honour to represent, they have no such communication, and we have had to go down into our pockets to provide funds for the building of our own telephone lines. If those lines are going to be under Government patronage in one place, they must be under Government patronage everywhere.

Mr. GRAHAM: There are sections of the riding I represent which are not reached by the Bell Telephone company. I have become a member of a local organization to get telephone communication to these people. Had I known the Government intended to launch out into new fields in the federal telephone business, I would perhaps have asked the Government to build lines to some of these places. I see one province is to be given $219,000 in the supplementary estimates for telephones. When the people of other parts of the country become aware that the Government is providing telephonic communication in some parts of the country, while they have to construct their own lines, they will be displeased, to put it mildly. Years ago, of course the situation was different. Telephones were a new thing, and there was really only one company. At the present time there are local telephone systems throughout the length and breadth of the land, and we have passed legislation at this session of the House compelling the trunk lines to give connection with the local lines under certain conditions. I do not object to reasonable expenditure to open up the country, but, as my hon. friend (Sir Sam Hughes) says, if it is to be done in one part of the country it should be done everywhere. Within 150 miles of Ottawa there is territory just as remote from telephonic and telegraphic communication as is this community in Nova Scotia.

Mr. REID: In the province of Ontario the Government has a telephonic system.

Mr. GRAHAM: Where?

[Mr. J. D. Reid.]

Mr. REID: In the Timiskaming district.

Mr. GRAHAM: It is along the line of railway, probably.

Mr. REID: No, it is not along the railway We have cables to Amherst island, and we have a telephone system in some parts of New Ontario. There are so few people in the district that it would not pay a private company to build a line.

Sir SAM HUGHES: Then, am I to understand that if we come along with our petitions we will get the lines?

Mr. REID: No, not at all. The greater part of the older counties is well settled.

Sir SAM HUGHES: What about the parts which are not settled?

Mr. REID: The municipalities can give aid to any one who would put in private lines. Who in the world would ever build a line there in the districts around Tadousac or Chicoutimi? Those people are entitled to some communication with the outer world.

Mr. CARVELL: What about Dorchester county?

Mr. REID: The telephone system has been there for many years.

Mr. CARVELL: They are putting in a new one there now.

Mr. REID: We are dealing with this particular one now, and it has been established for many years. We are only following out the policy inaugurated several years ago, to give the people in that locality the use of this line.

Mr. NESBITT: Could the minister tell me how large a place Washabuck is?

Mr. REID: Perhaps the hon. member who comes from that district could answer that question.

Mr. McKENZIE: Washabuck, which is a small corner of my constituency is about the size of North Oxford.

Mr. NESBITT: North Oxford is bigger than the whole of Nova Scotia.

Mr. PUGSLEY: There is one very objectionable feature about these items. It is that they are brought in so late in the session in the supplementary estimates and in such large amounts. If it was necessary to provide for telegraph and telephone lines, the appropriation ought to have been asked for in the main estimates. The total in the main estimates for this service

is $60.875. The Supplementary Estimates are supposed to be for the purpose of covering items that have been overlooked in the Main Estimates. It is entirely wrong to leave important matters, which might as well have been provided for in the Main Estimates, until the Supplementary Estimates are brought down late in the session. While in the Main Estimates we are asked to privide $60.875, we are called upon to vote in the Supplementary Estimates the very large sum of $271,000 for this service, or more than four times the total of the vote contained in the Main Estimates. I have looked through some of these items. It is evident that it was not considered desirable to put them in the Main Estimates, because the largeness of the amounts would attract public attention and invite public criticism; or that the minister, seeing an election very near at hand, is impelled to realize the importance of putting these items in the Supplementary Estimates in order to gain popularity in the districts which will be affected. It is unfair to Parliament to ask us to vote this very large sum for this service, distributed over three provinces, and provided for in the Supplementary Estimates.

Mr. REID: I hardly think the hon. member is putting it fairly when he suggests that we are bringing down these Estimates so late in the session on account of an election coming on. These Supplementary Estimates have been down for some time. It has always been customary to bring down such Supplementary Estimates as are necessary during the latter part of the session. The adjournment for a couple of months and the time we have taken over important Bills has prevented the Estimates being taken up before this. When we made up these Estimates we believed and intended that there should not be an election this year.

Mr. GRAHAM: That is the Main Estimates.

Mr. REID: The main estimates and the supplementaries were prepared long before that. The extension of Parliament was referred to in the speech from the Throne, and these supplementary estimates were already prepared before we knew there would not be an extension of Parliament.

Mr. GRAHAM: Do I understand the hon. gentleman to say that we would not have had any supplementary estimates if there had been an extension granted?

Mr. REID: I say we expected we would have had an extension of Parliament.

Mr. GRAHAM: No, you did not expect that.

Mr. REID: Of course we expected it, because last year the extension was granted and the reasons this year were much stronger why it should be granted. If the hon. gentleman had carried out the same policy that he pursued last year, the reasons being much stronger this year, we should have had an extension of Parliament and we would not have had an election.

Mr. GRAHAM: If the hon. gentleman had done what he promised last year he might have had an extension.

Mr. CARVELL: We are going to have an election, and I am going to discuss the reason why this vote is brought down. These items are here, and I am afraid that the minister intends to force them through. This is in line with the general policy that I am protesting against under present conditions. First, the minister brought down the main estimates, and he only asked for $60,000 for all the telegraph and telephone lines in Canada. The votes were largely for repairs. But now he comes with supplementaries late in the session, and he wants between $200,000 and $300,000, and not for repairs at all. If it were only a question of the little item of $420 that is now under discussion, I would not raise any question about it. But my hon. friend is branching out upon a great scheme of public ownership of utilities in British Columbia, the end of which no man can see. He is asking for $219,000 for the province of British Columbia in addition to $22,400 voted in the main estimates. The item in the main estimates looked all right on its face. It says:

British Columbia—mainland telegraph and telephone lines—general repairs and improvements, $22,400.

That did not look very bad, and, therefore, Parliament might say that it was necessary to vote that in order to put the service in good condition and not allow deterioration to affect it. But he comes forward now with an entirely new policy. It is not a question of repairs at all; it is an absolutely new policy as far as British Columbia is concerned. A new policy also is contemplated in so far as some portions of Nova Scotia are concerned. I am not sufficiently acquainted with the geography of that portion of Nova Scotia to know exactly whether they have a telephone system in any of these places, but they must have in many of them. I cannot conceive that there are half a dozen places in Cape

Breton island where they do not have the telephone. The conclusion is forced upon one's mind that there is some connection between these telegraph lines being converted into telephone lines and the election. I know the gentleman who manipulates affairs in Cape Breton island. His name was mentioned last night.

Mr. LEMIEUX: Mr. Douglas.

Mr. CARVELL: Yes, John C. Douglas, and one becomes suspicious when he sees items like these appearing in the supplementary estimates. I have no objection to the $420 being expended for extending this line three miles, but I am going to vote against this item as a matter of principle. I asked the minister to cut out a quarter of a million dollars at St. John, for which I know a great many people will not thank me, and he has done it. I asked him to cut out a quarter of a million dollars at another place, which the minister has agreed to do. Now he comes forward with a quarter of a million for telegraph and telephone lines in British Columbia, and I am going to vote against it because I think it is my duty to do so.

I take the ground on broad principles that if everybody is asked to retrench owing to the exigencies of the situation, surely the Government ought to be asked to retrench. They have given us their pledge that they will not embark on any new schemes, and if they cannot build wharves, breakwaters or railroads, surely they are not justified in going on with a great system of telephones, the end of which nobody can see. I am voting against it on that broad ground. I quite agree with the minister that if you have a telegraph line and want to make a short extension it may be better to instal the telephone rather than the telegraph. That is quite reasonable. I know there was a time when it was necessary that the federal Government should extend the telephone line to the Yukon, as private enterprise could not do it. The Government was equally justified in building telegraph lines down the St. Lawrence and into the Saguenay and Chicoutimi districts. Private enterprise would not build up the Saguenay twenty-five years ago, and a line was necessary in order to give those people an outlet. It may have been necessary to build a telegraph line in Cape Breton island, although I do not believe it. But, I do not think it is necessary that this Government should vote $10,000 or $12,000 to extend that system in Cape Breton island, or $2,400 for a line in the county of Quebec. And surely it is not necessary to spend $2,500 for a telephone line in Dorchester. I am not now saying anything about British Columbia. The whole thing is as plain as the nose on a man's face the Government are starting out for the election and certain men have got in their work and have had these items put in the estimates. I think the Government should drop all these votes.

Mr. KYTE: When the Government established the telegraph line in Cape Breton, that course was quite justified, but when it comes to establishing telephones in the province of Nova Scotia, that is quite different. The provincial government some years ago passed an Act providing for the incorporation of rural telephone companies. The provincial government gave aid to these companies sufficient to pay for the wires and insulators, and for the swinging of the wires, so that the shareholders are called upon only to furnish the poles and set them up. As a consequence of that policy we have many rural telephone companies in Nova Scotia and they give a very efficient service. Their systems are connected, under the authority of the Utilities Board at Halifax, with the main telephone system of Nova Scotia. If the Government embark on a system of establishing telephone lines, they will interfere very materially with the enterprise of the people of Nova Scotia, which has already developed a very important system of rural telephones. If the Government contemplated only the extension of the telegraph lines, particularly for short distances like three miles, there could be no real objection, but I do say they are going to interfere with the enterprise and the industry of the people of eastern Nova Scotia and the island of Cape Breton if they establish a system of telephones. We will then have a multiplicity of telephone systems that will only lead to confusion and add to the cost to those who are obliged to use the telephone lines. The subscribers to rural telephone companies have to pay for their connection with the main telephone system, and if the Government establish a system of their own it means additional tolls to the subscribers, and more evil than good will result from the action of the Government. I do say that at present, in view of the assistance given to the establishing of rural telephone lines in Nova Scotia, this Government is going out of its way to interfere with a development that should be left entirely to the people.

Mr. PUGSLEY: I propose to move an amendment which I think is in order. I have not it written, but perhaps the minister would consent to its being passed.

Mr. KYTE: Who is the general superintendent of Government telephone and telegraph lines in Cape Breton?

Mr. REID: The deputy tells me he thinks his name is McKee.

Mr. KYTE: That is the general superintendent at St. John. He is the manager of the Western Union. There is a man, I think, named Livingstone.

Mr. REID: He is a line repairer under Mr. McKee.

Mr. KYTE: He has general charge of all lines in Cape Breton.

Mr. REID: Under Mr. McKee.

Mr. KYTE. Then there is a local man in each county responsible for the making of repairs. Who is responsible for seeing that these assistants actually do their work?

Mr. REID: Of course the system follows down from the general superintendent to each individual officer.

Mr. KYTE: If an assistant repairer was not doing his work, it would be the general repairer who would report to the Government.

Mr. REID: He would report to his superior officer.

Mr. KYTE: Who would see that a man who was not doing his duty was dismissed. I have a case in my county where that practice was not followed. I shall read the correspondence, which was produced in the House a few days ago, in answer to an order for all correspondence etc., relating to the dismissal of Hector Urquhart, as linemen between Grand river and Enon, Cape Breton county, and the appointment of Dan A. McLennan in his place. The correspondence reads:

Glace Bay, C.B., Sept. 16, 1916.

Hon. Robert Rogers,
Minister of Public Works,
Ottawa.

Re Government Telegraphs.

Dear Mr. Minister:—

I hereby recommend the dismissal of Hector Urquhart of Grand river, Richmond county, as telegraph line repairman, and the appointment of Dan A. McLennan, Head of Loch Lomond, as his successor.

The new appointee is more suitably located for giving attention to the repair work on the line, besides he is more efficient.

Yours faithfully,

(Sgd.) Jno. C. Douglas.

Telegraph Service, P.W.D.,
Ottawa, Sept. 27, 1916.

John C. Douglas, Esq.,
Glace Bay, N.S.
Local Repairer, Grand river—Enon.

Dear Sir:—

Having reference to your letter of the 16th instant to the Hon. the Minister of Public Works, I beg to acquaint you that an authorization has been given for the discontinuance of the services of Mr. Hector Urquhart and the appointment of Mr. Dan A. McLennan, Head of Lock Lomond, to succeed him.

The arrangement is being put into effect forthwith.

Yours faithfully,

(Sgd.) D. H. Keeley,
General Superintendent.

Then there are the following letters:

Ottawa, Sept. 27, 1916.

Hector Urquhart, Esq.,
Grand river, C.B.

Dear Sir:

I have from the Hon. the Minister of Public Works an instruction to discontinue your services as local repairer for the telegraph line between Grand river and Enon. You might please deliver to our agent at Grand river the tools, etc., which you have in your charge. The superintendent at St. John, Mr. C. W. McKee, is being advised of this requirement and will send you in due course whatever payment is due to you to the end of the present month.

Yours faithfully,

(Sgd.) D. H. Keeley,
Gen.-Supt.

Ottawa, Sept. 27, 1916.

Dan. A. McLennan, Esq.,
Head of Loch Lomond, C.B.

Dear Sir:

I have from the Hon. the Minister of Public Works an authorization given on the recommendation of Mr. J. C. Douglas for your appointment as local repairer for the Government telegraph lines between Grand river and Enon, a distance of about 19½ miles. The pay attached to this position is fifty dollars ($50) per annum, without any other allowance, and you will be expected to keep the line clear of interruption and promptly make trips over it for that purpose whenever called upon to do so by the Superintendent, Mr. C. W. McKee, at St. John, N.B., or his representative, Mr. A. E. Hoyt at North Sydney. Anything in the way of overhauling or reconstruction work when required will be attended by the general repairer for the district. The tools, etc., which have been in the care of the former repairer are being turned over to our agent at Grand river to whom you might please apply for them. Mr. McKee is being advised of your appointment, please let him know when you are ready and the payment for your ser-

vices will begin from the date you enter upon your duties.

Yours faithfully,
(Sgd.) D. H. Keeley,
Gen.-Supt.

Ottawa, Sept. 27, 1916.

C. W. McKee, Esq.,
Supt. Govt. Telegraph Service,
St. John, N.B.

Dear Sir:—Local Repairer—Grand River—Enon.

A change in the above position has been ordered whereby Mr. Hector Urquhart is to be retired and will be succeeded by Mr. Dan. A. McLennan of Head of Loch Lomond.

You might please see what it is contained in the two accompanying copies of letters sent to Messrs. Urquhart and McLennan to-day and take such further action as is found to be called for.

Yours faithfully,
(Sgd.) D. H. Keeley,
Gen.-Supt.

That is the history of this extraordinary transaction. The facts are these: Mr. E. D. McKillop who had the Government telegraph office at Grand River falls, and whose wife was the telegraph operator removed from that district about a year ago. The telegraph office, therefore, became vacant. Two applicants for the position presented themselves. One was this man D. A. McLennan and the other was a man named McLeod. They were equally deserving in the eyes of Mr. John C. Douglas, who holds the patronage for the county of Richmond. Mr. Douglas was unable to give both the position of telegraph operator, so he decided that he would have Mr. Hector Urquhart dismissed from the trifling position which he held as assistant to the repairer at St. Peter's, and bestow the position upon Mr. Dan A. McLennan. Through the adoption of this course, both his supporters would be reconciled; both would get some consideration for their political services. The minister said that the general repairer would be responsible to the Government for the proper discharge of the duties of the assistant repairers. That would appear to be reasonable and proper. If Mr. Hector Urquhart was not properly discharging the duties of his position, one would imagine that this Government would have received a report back from the local superintendent of lines to Mr. McKee at St. John, which report would have been transmitted to the department. No such thing happened; there was no question whatever about the efficiency with which Mr.

Urquhart was discharging his
4 p.m. duties. He had been assistant to the repairer for seven or eight years; no complaints had ever been made. If any complaints were to be made on account of any deficiency on his part, those complaints would come through the repairer at St. Peter's. But, upon the recommendation of Mr. John C. Douglas, the dispenser of patronage in that part of the country, who asserted that Mr. Hector Urquhart was not efficiently discharging his duties, the Government, without obtaining any report from their own officials, discharged Mr. Urquhart from the position which he held and handed over his paltry salary of $50 to Mr. Dan. A. McLennan, solely because of the dispute which had arisen as to which applicant should receive the position in the telegraph office. I am glad to see the Minister of Trade and Commerce (Sir George Foster) in his place, because the noble sentiments that he expressed two years ago, in which he deprecated the idea that patronage should continue, still re-echo through this Chamber. Only two days ago, when the member for Moosejaw (Mr. Knowles) suggested that there might be patronage in connection with the appointment of a commission that was under discussion at that time, the minister indignantly repudiated the idea that such would be the case. It is a matter of regret that the principles adhered to by the Minister of Trade and Commerce have not been adopted by his colleagues in the Cabinet. We have here the most contemptible instance of political partisanship ever heard of in a county where many instances have occurred in the last four or five years. Appeals are being made to all classes of the community to make sacrifices on account of the conditions in which we find ourselves; appeals are being made to all political parties to forget politics, to get together, to form a union government, to devote all their energies towards carrying on the war. While these professions of a desire for union among the people are being made, cabinet ministers resort to the most contemptible means of persecution of those who are not of the same political faith as themselves. I realize that nothing we can say on this side of the House will change the temper and spirit of the Government or the principles upon which it acts, but it is well that while these professions are being made by gentlemen upon the Government benches and by those sitting behind them; while they assert that they have eliminated politics entirely from all considerations of govern

ment, and that they honestly desire all political parties to unite for the purpose of carrying on the war, it is well that these instances should be brought before the public in order to show the people how hollow is the hypocrisy practised by hon. gentlemen opposite.

Mr. REID: The hon. gentleman (Mr. Kyte) is very much exercised over the fact that the late Minister of Public Works (Hon. Robert Rogers) took some advice from Mr. John C. Douglas. This is not the first time the hon. member has brought the name of Mr. John C. Douglas before the House. Every session an attack is made upon Mr. Douglas. My only knowledge of Mr. Douglas is that obtained through his visits to Ottawa, but I have always found him an upright and honourable man. I do not think that I am the only one who has confidence in Mr. Douglas. He placed himself before the constituents of the district which my hon. friend represents, or a portion of it, and if I remember rightly, he carried the constituency by an overwhelming majority. The people in that district, therefore, hold Mr. Douglas in great esteem; they showed by their vote that they preferred him to the gentleman who opposed him. Simply because Mr. Douglas places before the Government at Ottawa the requests of the people whom he has the honour to represent, is he to be slandered by the hon. gentleman? Is it to be said that the only way the people of my hon. friend's constituency can get fair play is by the adoption of his recommendations? With all due respect to the hon. member, if the patronage of his constituency were left in his hands, I would say: God help the Conservatives in that district.

That is my opinion of the hon. member. I am not saying it unfairly. I believe the hon. member has so much sympathy for his own friends that he would supply them first with all that they could get, and after that there would be nothing left for the Conservatives. The hon. member has also stated that this Government has been preaching that, since they have been in power, they have been treating those of the opposite political faith fairly. That is a fact. We have been dealing fairly with and keeping on all the officials, unless, by their own actions, they are entitled to be dismissed. I say, with all frankness, that that has been the case, and it is unfair for the hon. member to make such statements so far as public officials are concerned. Officials in both the Inside and Outside Services would justify the statement I have just made. The hon. member, because some officials have been dismissed on account of actions of their own, makes this onslaught to-day. Mr. John C. Douglas represents this particular constituency in the local legislature.

Mr. KYTE: He does not represent this constituency.

Mr. REID: He represents a constituency in the local legislature.

Mr. KYTE: The adjoining one.

Mr. REID: Well, the adjoining one. He has made the statement that he believes the people of that district would be better served if the office was more conveniently situated. The Great Northwestern Telegraph company, or the Canadian Pacific Railway company, change their offices every day in towns, villages, and districts to suit the convenience of the people of these localities. Just because Mr. Douglas happens to be the local member, a Conservative, and because the people of that district have done him the honour to choose him as a candidate at the next election to oppose some one—I do not know whether it is the hon. member or not—the hon. member makes this onslaught. I believe the representations of Mr. Douglas are entitled to consideration, and I do not believe he deserves the remarks made by the hon. member.

Mr. KYTE: The minister entirely loses the point of my criticism. I have no fault to find with the Government accepting political recommendations from Mr. John C. Douglas, as he is in charge of the patronage of that district. That, however, is not the case in this instance. Mr. John C. Douglas states that Mr. Urquhart is inefficient, that he ought to be dismissed for inefficiency, and another man appointed. What I find fault with is that there is no report from Mr. Urquhart's superior officer as to the manner in which he has been carrying on his work. If Mr. Douglas had said that Mr. Urquhart was a political partisan, and that, therefore, he ought to be dismissed, then on account of the precedents established by this Government during the last four or five years, nobody would be surprised, that his recommendation should be carried out, but he could not say that about Mr. Urquhart.

Mr. REID: Did not Mr. Douglas recommend this change in the location of the

office in order that the people might be better served?

Mr. KYTE: Is not the man placed over Mr. Urquhart the proper person to make a report to the department on that point?

Mr. REID: He may state that this man is well qualified to discharge his duties, but he cannot state as to the suitability of the location of the office. The people in the surrounding district would know what is most convenient for them.

Mr. KYTE: The general repairer for the telegraph lines lives at St. Peter's and goes over that territory week after week. He has on the line two or three assistants who have been there for the last five or six years. If Mr. Urquhart is not suitably situated to discharge his duties, or if he is inefficient, one would imagine that the Government would have received a report from Mr. Urquhart's superior officer, that report transmitted, if you will, by Mr. Douglas to the department. There is no suggestion from the general repairer for that district that Mr. Urquhart is inefficient or that he is not suitably located. Mr. Douglas wanted the office for a political friend. He could not trump up a charge of political partisanship against Mr. Urquhart, so he wrote a letter to the minister containing this statement:

> The new appointee is more suitably located for giving attention to the repair work on the line, besides he is more efficient.

One would imagine that the minister would have transmitted Mr. Douglas' letter to Mr. McKee, the superintendent over that section of the telegraph line, and got a report from him. Nothing whatever was done in that direction. Mr. Douglas' unsupported statement that Mr. Urquhart was inefficient in the discharge of his duties was accepted by the minister, and his dismissal was immediately asked for. The minister expressed a pious hope that God might help the Conservative party. If that is the best example that can be given of defence for their conduct, then I say: God help the Conservative party in the hands of the minister.

Mr. McKENZIE: We are lectured almost out of sight this afternoon because we happened to mention the name of this saintly man, John C. Douglas. If the minister will listen to me for a moment, he will understand why we do not like the idea of a government led and directed by Mr. John C. Douglas. Mr. Douglas is the local member for the county of Cape Breton, and if the minister would follow his history and the ways by which he succeeded in creating certain dissensions in the mining communities, so that he managed to secure a majority, he would not be very proud that this gentleman represents the county of Cape Breton. I had the privilege of meeting Mr. John C. Douglas in a local contest in the county of Victoria. He had in his hand a telegram which he said was from the Minister of Railways (Mr. Cochrane) telling him that a Mr. Angus R. Campbell, who had been dismissed by the Minister of Railways from the West Bay Road station on the Intercolonial would be restored to his position in a very short time. The telegram arrived in the county while the contest was on and while I was there with Mr. Douglas. Knowing the Minister of Railways, I was very much surprised that he would send such a telegram. I did not believe he had done so; I told the people I did not believe it; but Mr. Douglas was the big man that he is in the estimation of the Minister of Customs and acting Minister of Public Works, and people around there believed that he had received that telegram from the Minister of Railways. Mr. Douglas fooled this poor fellow who was dismissed and his friends into voting for his party. The man who was elected in the contest was unseated on account of bribery and corruption. Mr. Douglas went on the stand at the trial; the copy of this telegram was produced to him, and he was asked on oath: "Did you get this telegram from Mr. Cochrane?" He said: "Yes, not only did I get the telegram from Mr. Cochrane, but I discussed the matter with Mr. Cochrane." Shortly afterwards I moved in this House for all the correspondence and papers passed between the Minister of Railways and Mr. Douglas. Papers were brought down, and the return is still obtainable in this House, but there was never such a telegram sent. To make sure, I went to the minister and said: "Surely Mr. Douglas would not first lie about this thing to me and then go on the stand and swear to it." I asked the minister if there was such a telegram, and he told me that he never had, at least up to that date, had the slightest communication of any kind, by telegram or otherwise, with this man Douglas.

Still he went lying around the country, representing that Mr. Cochrane was trying to interfere in a local election. Mr. Campbell was never restored, and the minister never promised to restore him, but he got a few votes on the strength of the state-

ment. He got into the box and swore that a thing, which never existed, was true. That is the character of man the minister has in Mr. Douglas. His name is like a red rag to gentlemen who want to do things in a decent and honest way. If the minister desires to be led by John C. Douglas, he will have lots of trouble. I am simply giving a small part of his character.

Mr. SINCLAIR: Is the minister not going to consider the question whether he should pass these estimates for telegraph lines? I see no reason why telegraph lines should be built in Cape Breton, and not in other parts of Nova Scotia. It has been drawn to the minister's attention already that we have a very good telephone system in that province, and there are scarcely any of the rural districts which are not now supplied with telephones. The local government has done a great deal to encourage the telephone system of the province. They have a superintendent who looks over the ground when any new line is to be established, and the government gives financial assistance, and the farmers and fishermen can, without expense get incorporation to organize telephone companies. There is a subsidy of $20 a mile which, as the hon. gentleman from Richmond stated, in ordinary times paid for the wire, so that the local people have only to provide the poles, and set them up, and provide the boxes which is done at very little expense. In this way provincial government aid has enabled the people of Nova Scotia to have rural telephones in all the districts. Unless we are going to embark on a Federal Government telephone system, and supply such places as Mabou harbour, Margaree harbour and Baddeck with telephones, I do not understand what justification there can be for this vote. There must be something behind this that we do not understand. No one from that locality will tell the minister that it is necessary to spend this public money in that district, unless it is for the accommodation of one or two friends of John C. Douglas. No doubt it is a political scheme, and I do not think the minister should ask the House, at a time like this when we are endeavouring to save money, to embark on the work of constructing these lines, unless the minister agrees to embark generally on the construction of telephone lines. We should not start this construction unless we adopt some kind of a policy on the whole question. The minister is projecting not only these lines in Nova Scotia, but lines in the other provinces of Canada, which we find provided for in these estimates. If we pass this item for the construction of telephone lines in Nova Scotia without any protest, we will be committed to the construction of telephone lines in other provinces. We want to know what the minister's policy is. Is he going to build telephone lines all through Canada, or is he not? If he is not, I do not think these lines proposed in Nova Scotia are justified at all.

Mr. REID: In Cape Breton we have, on the Government system, 948 miles of lines, of which 719 are operated by telephone, with 88 offices, and 129 operated by telegraph, with 45 offices. This system has been established for years.

Mr. SINCLAIR: I am talking about extensions.

Mr. REID: This is for half a dozen extensions. It is not a new policy. $3,400 of this item is for re-poling and general repairs. Every year since the system was started small extensions have been made. Whether it is a government or a private system, small extensions will always be necessary.

Mr. SINCLAIR: Will the minister establish telephone lines in my constituency if I send a list of those that are necessary?

Mr. REID: None of these systems are on the mainland, which is served by a private corporation. If we acceded to the hon. gentleman's request we would be starting on a new policy, so far as the mainland of Nova Scotia is concerned, and that question would have to be considered before I could give an answer.

Mr. SINCLAIR: Are not those lines in British Columbia and the other provinces on the mainland?

Mr. REID: They are in outside districts, which are sparsely settled, and where you could not get a private corporation to build a telephone system. Those systems were established years ago. We had them in the Yukon long ago.

Mr. CHISHOLM: I see here an item for a branch telephone line from Inverness to Mabou harbour. There as two possible routes which that line might follow. I want to know which route it will follow. I am quite in accord with the idea of constructing that branch, because it is very necessary. I have been advocating it for years.

Mr. REID: That is from Inverness to Sight point, Sight point to Mabou mines, and Mabou mines to Mabou harbour.

Mr. CHISHOLM: What is the distance?

Mr. REID: Five miles from Inverness to Port Ban, and two and one half miles from Port Ban to Sight point, seven miles from Sight point to Mabou Mines, and three miles from Mabou mines to Mabou harbour; a total of seventeen and one-half miles.

Mr. CHISHOLM: This line goes from Margaree harbour to Chimney corner. How is it that this line stops at Chimney corner contrary to the promise made to me six months ago? I cannot understand why the line should be stopped there, because that is only a short distance from Margaree harbour, and just as important a section of the country lies to the south of that. I would expect the line to go at least as far as Ste. Rose and Dunvegan to serve the whole settlement there. I have been advocating this for the last two years and got the assurance of the Government that the line would extend from Margaree to Dunvegan. I think the line should stop at Dunvegan. I am not finding fault with this construction, because it is only in accord with the suggestions I have been making for two years and the Government is only carrying out part of their promise. The only fault I find is that they are not carrying the line as far as they promised.

Mr. REID: I understand the hon. gentleman thinks that this line running from Margaree harbour to Chimney corner, five miles, should be continued six miles further.

Mr. CHISHOLM: I should think it should go six miles further, because there is a very important settlement there all along the line to Dunvegan.

Mr. REID: The proposal of the minister this year is to take the five miles and in another year he will consider the extension. These are all small extensions, and there are requests for further extensions. They must be extended to these different places from time to time as the Government can see its way clear to extend them. That has been the policy of all governments for the last thirty or forty years in regard to these telephone and telegraph systems. The hon. member knows that members on both sides of this House from those different places which are dependent on telephone and telegraph lines owned by the Government have asked for these things, and this is part of what has been asked for.

Mr. CHISHOLM: There is only one complaint I have to make, and it is the same as the complaint I made last year. So far as the county of Inverness is concerned, the policy is not an old one at all. It was inaugurated by the present Government in 1911. The late Government had provided for telegraph lines in certain sections of the county, which were in process of completion when the present Government took charge. This Government converted the telegraph system into a telephone system. I cannot understand why the Department of Public Works would not extend the same privilege to our people as would be extended to them by any private telephone corporation. For instance, if John Smith, or Tom Jones, wishes to get a telephone in his house he should be able to do so. The Government will not permit this, however. I cannot understand why they insist on placing the telephone offices in the hands of their own friends, to the exclusion of every one else. I submitted this complaint to the Minister of Public Works last year. If it is the intention of the Government to serve the public, I cannot see any reason why they should refuse telephones to any person who is prepared to pay for them. I know the system as it is now is nothing more nor less than a little bit of political machinery. I have no doubt if my own party came into power, and if we were to allow certain advisers to guide us, the same system would be followed. Personally, I would not stand for it, and the best element of the population would not stand for it. To my mind it is a preposterous condition of affairs that you cannot go to any of these telephones and talk to your friends without everybody excepting your friends hearing what you have to say.

Mr. CARVELL: Does the minister want any further evidence of the absolute viciousness of the whole system, beyond what has been given by the hon. member for Inverness?

Mr. REID: The hon. member has just said he requested this line.

Mr. CARVELL: Think of a telephone system being installed for the benefit of the public, and a Liberal cannot get a telephone in his house even if he is willing to pay for it, and cannot hold a conversation over the telephone without every Conservative in the place hearing what he has to say. The minister wants Parliament to

vote nearly $300,000 to perpetuate a system of that kind. Of course, the minister is not responsible for this condition of affairs, and I sympathize with him. He is working under an existing system, and he is forced to come here and put this through. At the same time, any man who has any idea of right and wrong must rebel against the perpetration of such a system. If you are going to run a telephone line for the benefit of the public why cannot every man get an instrument if he is willing to pay for it and comply with the requirements? I am a director of the New Brunswick Telephone company, and I can speak with some knowledge of the business. If any officer of our company refused to instal an instrument, for a man who was prepared to pay for it and to comply with the requirements, such an officer would not last ten minutes. Just as long as this Government, or I think any other government in Canada, tries to operate telephones, or railways, or electric lights, or any other public service in Canada, just so long will you have this contemptible, small, party patronage. It seems to me the time has come when the Government should be big enough to get away from this. I am not taking any "holier than thou attitude," and I admit if our party came into power many people would wish to perpetuate the same contemptible little system. It seems to me there must be a great change of sentiment in Canada before any Government can carry on these systems and make them of any practical benefit to the public. The whole principle is so vicious that I feel the minister would be justified in abandoning it entirely, not only in Nova Scotia, but in Dorchester county and everywhere else, and when the war is over let us see if we cannot get back to some sort of business principles. If the Government is going to operate telephones, let it make some arrangement with the local people to go out of business, then take over the lines and give a really useful and businesslike service. There must be many places in the island of Cape Breton where they have telephone communication at the present time? Are there no telephone systems in Inverness?

Mr. CHISHOLM: Yes, but not sufficient. We want to get more.

Mr. McKENZIE: The heading of this item is somewhat misleading. I asked the minister if this little extension from Washabuck Wharf to McKay's point was a telegraph line or a telephone line, and the minister told me it was a telephone line. If it is a telegraph line I have no fault to find, because it is a continuation of the line which is there already.

Mr. REID: The deputy minister informed me it was a telephone line, but that is a mistake. It is a telegraph line, and it is so marked on the map.

Mr. McKENZIE: That is certainly sensible, because it is a continuation of a telegraph line already in existence.

Mr. CARVELL: What are the rules and regulations governing the location of instruments, the granting of privileges, the tolls or rentals, the revenue received, and the operating expenses? I would like the minister to tell us just how bad it is, from an economic standpoint.

Mr. REID: The information my hon. friend is asking for is published.

Mr. CARVELL: What is the deficit?

Mr. REID: I do not know what the deficit is. We have quite a telegraph and telephone system in Canada, comprising about 11,600 miles altogether.

Mr. CARVELL: How many instruments have you?

Mr. REID: I could not say offhand. Of course, you cannot expect much of a revenue from many of these places. It costs a great deal of money to build a line, and in many sections the country is sparsely settled. My hon. friend may be right in saying that probably the time is coming when this whole system should be revised, but it is a system which has grown up, and these extensions have to be made. I do not see that we can do anything else, unless we took over the whole thing.

Mr. CARVELL: I will admit that so far as Nova Scotia, New Brunswick, and possibly Ontario lines are concerned, the system may not be so reprehensible, because there you are to some extent face to face with existing conditions. Quebec and British Columbia are different, and I have some doubt as to the advisability—

Mr. COCHRANE: There are none in Ontario.

Mr. CARVELL: Yes, I find this item in the estimates.

Bath, Amherst Island telephone line—reconstruction and improvement, $2,200.

There is one part of my question to which the minister has not replied, and that is: What are the conditions of the service?

How do people obtain instruments and what rentals or tolls are charged? We all have some idea what it is costing for telephone service generally and I would like to know what people are paying for this service. I would like also to know if what my hon. friend from Inverness (Mr. Chisholm) says is correct. If it be true that nobody can get telephones, except a few picked out by the patronage committees for the purpose of listening to all that is going over the line, there would not be much business done over a line of that kind.

Mr. REID: I heard the remark of the hon. member for Inverness and it strikes me that it would be a remarkable system if it was carried on in that way and if it is being carried on in that way, it will be remedied. It would not be fair to have a system that only those who might be supporting the political party in power would be allowed to use, and conversations were permitted to be publicly known. With reference to the other question as to the conditions under which the telephone and telgraph services are given to the public, I might say that we have 10,300 miles of telegraph lines. There is only one office and one operator in each locality. There are 1,300 miles of telephone lines throughout Canada. My information is that people living along the line are entitled to telephones on payment of a rental. The rental varies in different localities. There is no regular rate. It just depends on the different settlements.

Mr. CARVELL: Does the minister mean to say that they have no schedule by which a man can say: "I am entitled to a telephone if I pay so much a year"?

Mr. REID: It differs in different localities.

Mr. CARVELL: How could it differ? If you have a telephone line in Cape Breton, does the minister mean to say there is no schedule by which a man can say: "If I pay a rental of $15, or $18, or $21 a year, I can get an instrument"? Is it as bad as that? If it is, it is worse than the condition pointed out by my hon. friend from Inverness, because in my friend's case the use of this service is confined to one political party. If on the other hand, there is no schedule and they can give one friend a telephone for $10 and the next one a telephone for $15, the minister is discriminating as between his own friends.

Mr. REID: My information is that the rates vary. The rate in one locality may be more than it is in another. When a telephone line is constructed in Inverness or any other locality, the Government will charge a rental that will pay for the maintenance and cost of construction of the line. They are not making a lot of money out of it. They want to give the people the benefit of this service at the lowest rate. In some localities the line may cost more than in others. It is not like a private corporation that is in it to make profits.

Mr. CARVELL: As much as the public utility boards will allow them.

Mr. REID: They may possibly do that in New Brunswick.

Mr. CARVELL: That is done in Ontario too.

Mr. REID: In Ontario the service is pretty good, but there are some parts of Canada where it is not as good as in Ontario or New Brunswick. That is the reason why the rates vary.

Mr. SINCLAIR: What is the rate in Cape Breton?

Mr. REID: I have not got it before me.

Mr. SINCLAIR: The minister ought to have that information.

Mr. REID: I will get it.

Mr. SINCLAIR: All we ever heard about this telegraph service in Cape Breton was in connection with the Victoria by-election. It was used by the Conservative party to carry messages free for the Conservative party prior to the election. It was thrown absolutely open. They sent as many messages as they pleased to people along the line and paid nothing for the service. It was proven at the trial that any messages sent by the other side were open to them and that there was no secrecy about the messages. That seems to bear out the theory of my hon. friend from Inverness (Mr. Chisholm) that this telegraph and telephone system is just an annex to the patronage committee of the Conservative party in Cape Breton. That is one reason why we would like to have more information. I would like the minister to tell the committee if these lines are free to the Conservative party in Cape Breton and, if he is charging anything to others, what amount is he charging. My hon. friend from Inverness has made the statement that the department does not give accommodation to people along the line if they are not of the right political stripe. That is rather a serious charge.

I do not want to vote for this appropriation, although it is small, unless the minister will say that every man along the line, of whatever stripe of politics he may be, will be entitled to hook on the line provided he pays for it at a uniform rate. My hon. friend from Inverness has stated that he had complained last year that people who had made application had been unable to get the telephone service while the country is paying for the lines. Will the minister say that in future any man who applies for a telephone, lives up to the rules, whatever they are, and pays his money, will be entitled to the service?

Mr. REID: I will certainly say that. If the telephone service is there, every man, irrespective of what his politics are, must have a telephone in accordance with the rules that have been laid down for that particular line. I will find out if there are any complaints and, if there are, they will be attended to. I have sent for the rates. This line has been there for many years. I suppose that while my hon. friends opposite were in power for fifteen or sixteen years the line was carried on.

Mr. CHISHOLM: No, the telephone has been in existence only for the last five years.

Mr. REID: That is only in that constituency, but there are other parts where it must have been for a longer period.

Mr. CHISHOLM: That was the telegraph line.

Mr. REID: If there has been any change in the telegraph or telephone system, or if the lines are being used as the hon. member has said, that would be most unfair and unjust, and I do not think any minister would stand for it for a minute, or permit any operator in charge of an office to be guilty of such conduct.

Mr. MORPHY: Are there not public pay stations with cabinets?

Mr. REID: There are public pay stations into which any person can go and talk so that the operator cannot hear.

Mr. MORPHY: Then how does the want of secrecy occur?

Mr. REID: They have their public places to talk.

Mr. CHISHOLM: No.

Mr. CARVELL: No. There is no such thing on Cape Breton Island as a pay station with a cabinet. The telephone instrument is put into the kitchen of somebody who happens to be the head worker for the party.

Mr. REID: The hon. gentleman does not know, he has not been there himself.

Mr. CARVELL: I am properly describing the conditions. I have been in Cape Breton island a good many times, and I know something about what goes on down there. Talking about having a cabinet with any secrecy in a public telephone system on the island of Cape Breton—you might as well talk about finding a white blackbird. They do not do it that way.

Sir GEORGE FOSTER: That is true of some other telephone systems is it not?

Mr. CARVELL: To some extent.

Sir GEORGE FOSTER: People are very curious.

Mr. CARVELL: But in other places they make a pretense of secrecy. Not so in Cape Breton Island. Does the department rent telephones to subscribers or simply put an instrument in some person's house and call that a station from which the people may telephone? I had an idea that there was no such thing there as rental to subscribers. People simply use sufficient political influence to have a telephone put in somebody's kitchen and then the neighbours go and talk over the instrument in the kitchen while the family carry on their conversation.

Sir GEORGE FOSTER: It cannot be that way unless it is a thing inherited in 1911 by my hon. friend.

Mr. CARVELL: There were no telephones then, they were all telegraphs.

Mr. GRAHAM: These listening boards seem to have been established since 1911. I want to ask the minister if he thinks it right, under present conditions, to put in the estimates $272,000 for telephone in British Columbia?

Mr. REID: That is not all for telephones, some of it is for repairs to present lines.

Mr. GRAHAM: There is $272,000 for telephone and telegraph systems, and a great portion of that is for new lines. For repairs to existing lines, provision should be made, because otherwise these lines would go out of use, and the people who now have the accommodation should not be deprived of it; we should keep up our property. But when the minister starts out on

the wholesale construction of new lines, it is not fair to the country. Of this $272,000, I imagine $50,000 or $60,000 would repair all his lines, and to that extent no person could object to the vote. But the people of Canada, in their present temper, with our taxation and the financial pressure now upon us, no matter what their politics may be, will wonder how the Government can justify the plunging into an expenditure of more than a quarter of a million dollars where perhaps $50,000 or $60,000 would do. Every person is making some sacrifice, and if the people who will be accommodated by this large new expenditure were asked, I have no doubt that 95 per cent of them would say: Let it stand until after the war is over. That is the spirit of the Canadian people. We heard this afternoon about a request made by Lieutenant-Colonel Merritt. We have all received that request. One of the great needs of the Allies to-day is greater strength in the air. We read to-day, yesterday, and the day before, of attacks made on London and other parts of England by air raiders. Colonel Merritt asks that a large number of air fighting machines be procured, and so necessary does he think they are that he is soliciting private aid. With this vote of $272,000, thirty-eight air fighting machines could be procured. If we took $60,000 out of this $272,000 for repairs, and I submit that would be enough, we could send the Allies thirty of these air fighting machines. I leave it to the minister to say to which purpose we ought to devote this money.

Mr. DAVIDSON: I am not surprised that the hon. member for Carleton (Mr. Carvell) should oppose public ownership. I understand that he is a director and shareholder in a very profitable electric light company and also in a very profitable telephone company, a privately owned corporation; and it is not uncommon for men in those positions to resist any advance along the line of public ownership. But if I have observed the attitude of the public correctly, the whole trend is towards the public ownership of these public utilities, and although these big financiers, who are looking for big profits, may resist and protest, this wave of public ownership is coming over this country. The hon. member for Carleton and all the other vested interests in the country notwithstanding, public ownership is going to prevail in this country, and the people are going to be served well.

Mr. CARVELL: That is the first time I was ever called a big financier. I do not know whether to take that as complimentary or otherwise.

Mr. DAVIDSON: I think my hon. friend is fast approaching that class, and if his company is allowed to operate these concerns, which I believe are very successful, he will approach that class, if he is not in it already.

I am a little surprised that hon. gentlemen representing Nova Scotia constituencies have not arisen to defend the maintenance by the Government of telephone and telegraph lines in Cape Breton. I am not particularly acquainted with the locality but I have been there several times, and my observation has been that the telephone and telegraph services there are of great convenience to the people. I refer particularly to North Cape Breton and Victoria. There are in that county large sections where the people are very much isolated and would be almost out of the world if they were not kept in touch with other parts of the province by means of the telegraph. Without it they would never get news or be able to summon a doctor, as no private company would think of establishing a telephone or telegraph line there for profit. Such a line must be run at a loss. But the people are a deserving people; they are doing a good work; they are engaged in fishing and producing wealth for the country, and I think it is only just that the Government should spend money in their behalf. I should be sorry if the Government curtailed a public service of this kind. I was amazed at the assertion made by the member for Inverness (Mr. Chisholm) in regard to the partisan manner in which, as he alleges, the system is conducted. I would not doubt the word of my hon. friend; I do not believe that he would deliberately deceive the people, but I am inclined to think that he has been victimized; he has been wrongly informed. I should be surprised, indeed, if, in a certain village where there was a telephone line, a man would be refused a telephone because he was a Liberal and another man would be given one because he was a Conservative.

Mr. CHISHOLM: It was a surprise to me.

Mr. DAVIDSON: I would like the hon. gentleman to give the chapter and verse; I would like him to give the names. The hon. gentleman would not dare go into the county of Inverness and make the statements that he has made here to-day. I do not believe that anything of the kind

is done. It is true that a man living remote from the main line might make application for a telephone and the authorities, upon consideration, might decide that it was not practicable to grant his request. But that is what private corporations are doing. The company of the member for Carleton (Mr. Carvell) does not put in at the regular rate a telephone for every person who asks for it; it does not run private wires six or seven miles for the sake of giving service to one person. So that quite as much complaint could be made about the operation of telephones and telegraphs by private corporations in Nova Scotia as could be made respecting the operation of lines by the Government. The hon. gentleman speaks about the lack of a public telephone. In every rural community in Nova Scotia the same method is followed as that which is followed by the Government in Cape Breton county. Perhaps in a certain locality a public telephone will be placed in somebody's kitchen. A man comes in and uses the phone; somebody on the line may hear his message. But you cannot expect in a rural community all the facilities and accommodations that are afforded in cities. The Government telephones are operated in Nova Scotia just as other privately owned telephone systems are operated under similar circumstances. There is a regular scale of rates; the public are served much in the same way, but with this difference: the private corporation could not be induced to serve some of the territories that are served by Government telephone systems. Through the extension of the Government phones to these remote districts, great convenience is
5 p.m. enjoyed by the people. I think the people would resent the suggestion that the Government should withdraw from this business and allow privately owned and operated telephone systems to serve the country. So far from suggesting that government ownership of telephones be curtailed, I would say that we ought to enlarge and extend the operation of such government owned public utilities.

Mr. CHISHOLM: I do not know why my hon. friend is so lavish with his challenges. He does not know the first thing about the matter; he does not know any more about the district that I have in mind than a babe unborn.

Mr. DAVIDSON: May I ask the hon. gentleman to be good enough to give the names and the places where, as he states, such discrimination occurred?

Mr. CHISHOLM: I wish the hon. gentleman would be good enough to sit down until I have finished. I called the attention of the Minister of Public Works to this matter two years ago. At that time, if my memory serves me correctly, the minister said that it was his policy not to rent phones to anybody.

Mr. CURRIE: Do any private companies operate in that part of the country?

Mr. CHISHOLM: Yes, but not in this particular section where the lines are to be built. My hon. friend challenged me to give instances of cases where Liberals were refused phones. I could give him a dozen instances. I challenge the hon. gentleman to name one person in the district of North Inverness who is a Liberal and who has a phone. There is not one instance. I would no more use one of those phones if I had a political message to send than I would hang myself.

Mr. DAVIDSON: I challenge the hon. gentleman to give names and places and to inform the committee where any Liberal has been discriminated against.

Mr. CHISHOLM: I will satisfy my hon. friend: North East Margaree and South West Margaree.

Mr. DAVIDSON: Give the names.

Mr. CHISHOLM: I refuse to be catechised by my hon. friend to that extent. I will not answer all his petty questions.

Mr. CARVELL: The minister was to give information to the committee as to the rates charged, the rentals, the difference between the price charged to Liberals and the price charged to Conservatives, and so on.

Mr. REID: If a man who lives half a mile from the line, has a phone, he is charged $4.50 per annum. If he lives a mile away, the charge is $9.

Mr. CARVELL: Suppose he is on the line?

Mr. REID: If he uses the public telephone, he pays a certain fee.

Mr. CARVELL: Generally speaking, except in the case of a man who lives off the main line, there is no such thing as a general rental system.

Mr. REID: No, any one has a right to use the public telephone and to pay for any message that he sends over the lines. Returns are regularly sent in as to the number of messages and the tolls collected.

Mr. CARVELL: What are the rates charged for a conversation over distances of 25, 50, 100 miles? There must be a certain schedule of tolls, according to the distance.

Mr. REID: The rates are somewhat the same as those charged by privately owned companies under similar circumstances.

Mr. CARVELL: What is the rate per conversation, not per minute?

Mr. REID: They charge so much per minute for the conversation, according to the distance. The method followed is the same as that adopted by, say, the Bell Telephone Company—or, indeed, any other private company.

Mr. NESBITT: Does the minister mean to tell the Committee that the Government puts up the poles and wires and establishes a telephone half a mile away from the main line for $4.50 a year? We had better let the Government put in all the phones.

Mr. REID: The people who use the public phones pay for their messages; I have given the rates charged to persons who have their own phones.

Mr. NESBITT: What is the yearly revenue obtained from these phones?

Mr. REID: The revenue from all these systems is published in the annual report.

Mr. CHISHOLM: If I make a recommendation to the minister to give telephones to, say two or three persons in my district, will he give me an assurance that he will do so. I will give the minister my word of honour that I will recommend only persons qualified to use those telephones.

Mr. REID: I have stated the policy adopted by the department. As I understand it, if a man applies for a telephone along the line, the department gives it to him, and it is practically made a public telephone. Whatever the policy is—and that is as I understand it—if the hon. member sends me the name of a party, I will see that he is put on that telephone line. There will be no discrimination. Every man will have the same right on that line, irrespective of politics or anything else. If a man, whether in my hon. friend's constituency or in any other portion of Canada, makes an application for a telephone on a government line, I will guarantee that the policy of giving the public the use of those telephones as freely as it can be given will be carried out.

Mr. COPP: I notice in this report on telegraph statistics, which I have in my hand, the gross revenue for 1916, on lines under the control of the Dominion Government, amounts to $181,227.04, while the expenses amount to $661,982.34. There is therefore, a very large deficit.

Mr. REID: That is the expenditure for the whole of Canada, including extensions of lines.

Mr. COPP: There is a great difference between the revenue and the operating expenses.

Mr. MORPHY: I have listened for a long time to this discussion which seems to be more or less of a family quarrel amongst hon. members from Nova Scotia. I have never before seen the minister begged so hard to refrain from giving hon. gentlemen money as the minister has been begged today. I feel like voicing the opinions of my hon. friend (Sir Sam Hughes) and the hon. member for Renfrew (Mr. Graham) that this is an opportune time to ask the minister to turn his eyes to Ontario, the people of which province want the service that the people of Nova Scotia apparently do not desire.

While I quite understand it is hard to strike out an item that has been inserted after mature deliberation on the part of the officials surely the minister can do so this afternoon after the heckling he has received from the hon. member for Guysborough (Mr. Sinclair) who says: I have a number of friends who are going to get this extension, but, on their behalf, I do not want it and I ask you to strike out the item. The hon. member for Carleton (Mr. Carvell) wants to strike out everything. The hon. member for North Cape Breton (Mr. McKenzie) would also become very economical and not let anything further get to his friends. The hon. member for Inverness (Mr. Chisholm) is split in two; he is divided in the middle; he wants it and he does not want it; he says: If a real Liberal can get on to the extension, so that he will not be overheard, I want it; if that cannot be done, I do not want it. It is all a question of politics with hon. gentlemen opposite. I am sorry the hon. member for North Bruce (Mr. Hugh Clark) is not in the House. We have in old Ontario, to say nothing of the new, a large territory in which a system of this kind would be of great advantage. Take the Bruce peninsula, the land contiguous to Georgian bay and lake Huron, the territory running up to lake Nipissing and the north country; we can take thousands of miles of telegraph or telephone lines if the Government will only

give them to us. They would be of great benefit for life-saving purposes when storms occur on the lakes, and for warning against forest fires. These wants are apparently all satisfied in Nova Scotia.

Mr. BRADBURY: The people there do not want them.

Mr. MORPHY: They have them and they are using them. It is time for the Government to strike out those extensions which they have been coaxed to strike out. Why should the Government leave them in the estimates? Hon. gentlemen opposite represent the people there; they know what their constituents want, and they say those extensions are of no use to the electors, ratepayers, and citizens of various constituencies in Nova Scotia. Under the circumstances, I would for once go over the heads of the department who have recommended those public benefits and say to the hon. member for Guysborough (Mr. Sinclair): All right, we will cut out your extension telegraph service; and I would say the same to the hon. member for Inverness (Mr. Chisholm).

Mr. CHISHOLM: I am heartily in accord with the idea of continuing the expenditure. The hon. gentleman is wrong when he includes me with the other hon. members.

Mr. MORPHY: I will leave my hon. friend to fight it out with his fellow members on the other side. I take from his statement the argument that the extension is of some service in at least one county—

Mr. CHISHOLM: Certainly it is.

Mr. MORPHY: —and that the extensions are desired and required. I would cut out all the extensions except that one in the county of Inverness, on the request of the hon. members who represent those counties. The money could be saved and sent up to the province of Ontario, as extensions are very badly needed in some of the northern sections in which the inhabitants are labouring under greater disadvanages than are the people of Nova Scotia. If there is any legal way of accomplishing this, the minister should strike out all those other extensions now and give extensions in the northern parts of Ontario where they are much more needed.

Mr. CHISHOLM: Excepting Inverness.

Mr. McKENZIE: The hon. member is altogether wrong in saying that I oppose any accommodation to the people in my county of North Cape Breton and Victoria. The wrong information was given to me by the minister. Inadvertently he told me he was going to put in three miles of telephone line at the end of about 100 miles of telegraph line. I could not understand the sense of putting in three miles of telephone line which would have no connection with any telephone system. After a little further inquiry, the minister and I discovered that this was merely a three-mile extension of the telegraph system in the county, and with that I am perfectly satisfied. I did however, combat the idea of building three miles of a telephone line all by itself with no earthly connection with any other telephone line and of no use to anybody. Those telegraph lines in the northern part of Victoria and throughout Cape Breton were put in by our own friends when we were in power, and we are not going to find fault with them to-day.

New Brunswick telegraph and telephone lines —Chatham—Escuminac and Point Sapin telephone line—extension to Kouchibouguac, $3,000.

Mr. REID: The superintendent states that this extension is required in order to reach the fishery establishment at Kouchibouguac.

Mr. CARVELL: Who owns the fishery establishment?

Mr. REID: The W. S. Loggie Company, Limited.

Mr. CARVELL: As I am afraid there may be some connection between the W. S. Loggie Co. Limited and the hon. member for Northumberland, I want to put myself straight on the situation. I am just as strongly opposed to this vote as I was to the vote in regard to Nova Scotia, or as I will be in regard to the votes in regard to Quebec and British Columbia. I have never been on the ground actually myself, but, as I understand, perhaps 30 or 40 years ago the Federal Government built a telegraph line from Chatham, down the south bank of the Miramichi river, running out to a point at the mouth of the Miramichi river called Point Escuminac. This line was extended to Point Sapin. It was for many years run as a telegraph line, and no doubt was of very great value, because it was used in connection with shipping; the arrival and departure of vessels being telegraphed to Chatham and in that way reached headquarters at Ottawa. I have never been at this place myself and, therefore, I cannot speak with the knowledge of the hon. gentleman from Northumberland, but I know that the New Brunswick Tele-

phone Company goes to Escuminac, and has a line to Kouchibouguac. It seems this is a proposal to extend the line beyond the point at which the Government line of telephone comes in contact with the New Brunswick line.

Mr. REID: Do I understand that when this is constructed it will join up the present Government system?

Mr. CARVELL: No, they are joined up now. Some years ago the telegraph line was converted into a telephone line, and an arrangement was made with the New Brunswick Telephone Company by which there was interchange of service. I do not remember the details, but I think it was satisfactory to both companies, as they come together at Kouchibouguac. This proposal is that the Government shall extend 10 or 12 miles further down the bay. I am opposed to it.

Mr. REID: Will there be opposition?

Mr. CARVELL: No, I believe it is not covered by any telephone line, and I do not believe it is a paying line, but, for all that, I am opposed to it, and I believe that if they apply to the New Brunswick Telephone Company they can get a service, although it will be at a loss to the telephone company. If there has ever been an application to the New Brunswick Telephone Company to extend their line, I do not know about it, and I think if it happened in the last ten years I would know. The difficulty is that people start after the Government and say: Let us get the Government to do this. There is no money in the New Brunswick Telephone Company extending the line 10 or 12 miles down that shore; but I say here, with some knowledge of the responsibility of the position I occupy, I believe that, if the people try, they will get the service. I have never heard of an application to that effect, but I think my hon. friend from Northumberland knows what he is doing. He says: Let us get the Government to do this. If they can get the Government to do this on the same terms as they get the service in Nova Scotia, $4.50 for a telephone—on the mainland it is nothing except a small toll service—no wonder they want the Government to do it. There is no reason why the Government should interfere with any of these utilities, except in a place which is inaccessible and where no privately-owned corporation would operate. It is all very well for the hon. gentleman from South Perth to talk about going up into the wilds of Ontario. No doubt people up there would like telephones. We have places in New Brunswick where the lumbermen would like telephones, but they have to build them themselves. I do not see why they cannot build lines into the forests of Ontario, as well as they can in New Brunswick. I am talking on a question of principle, and I am just as strongly opposed to this item as to any other similar item. I think the principle is bad. The Government should not meddle in the policy of building and operating telephone lines, whether in New Brunswick or any other province.

Mr. ROBIDOUX: I trust the minister will not treat too seriously the abuse which has been heaped on the Government telephone lines by hon. gentlemen opposite. I happen to know about that part of the line to which my hon. friend refers. It extends from Chatham to Point Sapin, part in Northumberland county, and part in Kent county. It is about 50 or 60 miles in length, and the proposition is now to extend it from Point Sapin to the Kouchibouguac river, following the shore, through districts sparsley settled, and altogether out of communication with the rest of the world. The people who live along the shore are engaged in fishing and the telephone service is their only means of communication with the outside world. The hon. member for Carleton (Mr. Carvell) referred to the New Brunswick Telephone Company, and the readiness of that company to do anything they could to give telephone facilities to the people of New Brunswick. I do not know how telephone companies act in other parts of the Dominion. But I want to say that in New Brunswick, so far as telephones are concerned, we have one of the worst monopolies in the Dominion of Canada. We formerly had two companies in New Brunswick, the Central Telephone Company and the New Brunswick Telephone Company. I do not know to which company the hon. gentleman belongs, but today competition has been absolutely abolished by the absorption of the Central Telephone Company by the New Brunswick Telephone Company. The hon. gentleman has stated that the New Brunswick Telephone Company was always ready to come to the rescue of people who desired telephone communication and I desire to say that that is not so. I know a number of instances where applications were made to the New Brunswick Telephone Company to extend their lines to different localities

and they would not give the people these facilities. The New Brunswick Telephone Company was generous enough to say to the people: You put up the poles, we will put up the wire, and the line will belong to us. That was the basis upon which they were prepared to give telephone communication to these people. The proposed line will end at Kouchibouguac beach. It does not connect in any way with the New Brunswick Telephone line at Kouchibouguac; it connects with the main line at Chatham, and gives very valuable service to the people of that section of the country; the government will be well advised, if they extend the system further whenever needed. Reference has been made to the amount paid for rental on these lines, and the $4.50 rate has been considered ridiculous by gentlemen opposite. Well, $4.50 at first sight is ridiculous, but it is not quite so ridiculous when you take into consideration the fact that by paying $4.50 you merely get communication with Chatham, and the localities along that line, which I say are sparsely settled.

Mr. CARVELL: 60 miles of communication.

Mr. ROBIDOUX: 60 miles of communication through wilderness, and the New Brunswick Company would not, under any consideration, undertake to build the line there, and the moment you reach Chatham if you want to communicate with any other portion of the province you must pay 25 cents to the New Brunswick Telephone Company. If you were to telephone into Chatham, in order to get your connection with the town of Chatham you must pay a pretty heavy toll. The Department of Public Works would be well advised not to pay too much consideration to all this howl which is raised against their telephone lines, which are giving good service to a portion of the population, which would not get any service at all were it not for those lines.

Mr. CARVELL: I do not want to go into a dissertation about the vices or virtues of this telephone company, because I would be very much out of order. I want to say to the hon. gentleman, however, and I am very glad to have an opportunity of making this statement to-day, that the New Brunswick Telephone Company has no monopoly in any portion of the province of New Brunswick. Any person or any company who can get the rights from the municipal authorities is absolutely free to parallel the lines of the New Brunswick Telephone Company at any place. We have competition in many parts of the province, and we encourage the construction of local companies wherever we can. In many cases we hand over certain territory to those people and say: Now, develop it. When I hear of the trouble they are having in Ontario in regard to telephone companies, I think there must be something wrong, either with the Bell Telephone Company or with the local companies, because we have no friction whatever in the province of New Brunswick. My hon. friend speaks about the charges made. It may surprise him to learn that in the province of New Brunswick we have the cheapest telephone service in the Dominion, and we have the finest example in Canada of what can be done by a properly organized and properly conducted public utility corporation. We have no mortgages and no bonds, and a very small capitalization.

Mr. SCHAFFNER: What does the farmer pay per year?

Mr. CARVELL: Fifteen dollars, for unlimited service.

Mr. SCHAFFNER: A party line?

Mr. CARVELL: Unlimited party line service. In some of the towns we get the service down as low as $15. To show you the difference between a properly operated company-owned line and a government-owned line, I will give you an illustration. There are about 1,000 telephones in the town in which I live, about one-half in the town and one-half in the country—the country subscribers get the service for $15 a year, and I think the lowest rate in the town is $15 or $18.

Mr. HANNA: That is for house telephones?

Mr. CARVELL: Yes, $18 for a business telephone. I simply mention this to show what can be done when a company operates a public utility under proper conditions.

Mr. COPP: Why is it lower in some towns than in others?

Mr. CARVELL: Because of the service given. The larger the exchange the higher the price, on the theory that they are getting more service from the telephones. So far as I know, the New Brunswick Telephone Company has never refused to grant a service, even though it be not upon a paying basis. No doubt there have been

many applications for service which have not been granted, and you will find that everywhere. My hon. friend says that if the people will erect the poles the company will agree to string the wires. That is true in many cases, and it has frequently been taken advantage of. I presume the same thing applies all over Canada. I would like to ask my hon. friend from Kent (Mr. Robidoux) whether the New Brunswick Telephone Company was ever asked to construct the line in question under this vote.

Mr. ROBIDOUX: I cannot give my hon. friend the information, but I believe the matter was broached when Mr. Richard O'Leary was a member of the board of directors of the New Brunswick Telephone Company, and my information is that the company could not consider the question of establishing a telephone line in that district, because the line would have to be built through about ten miles of uninhabited country, from which no revenue would be derived. From a business standpoint the proposition could not be considered at all, and the New Brunswick Telephone Company would not consider it. The company is not in business for the good of the health of its members; it is in business for dollars and cents, and that is the policy it followed ever since it has had the monopoly. Before the New Brunswick Telephone Company had obtained a practical monopoly in the province we could get certain privileges and certain advantages from the rival companies, but evidently the competition was not satisfactory to the shareholders of the New Brunswick Telephone Company, so they absorbed these other companies. This was good business. Although it is permissible for any man or any body of men to start a telephone company in the province of New Brunswick. it is a difficult matter to carry on a business of that kind with competition as strong as the competition of the New Brunswick Telephone Company. For that reason there are no rival companies. In many instances the rates of the New Brunswick Telephone Company are fair, but in many others which I could enumerate if this were the time and place, they are unfair.

Mr. GRAHAM: If the Government persists in spending $272,000 to instal new lines, when $50,000 or $60,000 would be sufficient to repair the old lines, when they go to the people and ask them to economize, they need not be surprised if the people laugh at them and have no confidence in their sincerity. If they propose to build new lines to the extent of at least $200,000 which could be done without until the war is over, and then ask the people to contribute for war purposes, they need not be surprised if the people ask them why they did not save $200,000 when they had an opportunity. I protest strongly against a dollar being expended for new lines at the present time. Old lines should be repaired and kept in as good conditions as possible, but the people of Canada can until after the war join in the sacrifice which is being made, by doing without telephone lines which they never before had. If the Government persists in spending this money at the present time, they are not keeping faith with the people, and they are not using their best endeavours to conserve the finances of the country in order that the war may be prosecuted.

Mr. COPP: I do not rise for the purpose of objecting to or criticising the particular item under discussion. I would like to ask the acting Minister of Public Works upon what basis he makes the estimate to give aid to certain sections of the province and not to the others? I quite understand the argument made by my hon. friend from Kent (Mr. Robidoux) that it would be a very great advantage if the Government owned the telephone service in that section of the province of New Brunswick which is sparsely populated. But there are other portions of New Brunswick to which the like argument would apply. Will the same consideration be granted to other portions of New Brunswick as is being granted to this section?

Mr. REID: This is merely an extension of the present line. We are not adopting the policy of starting out in some other place to build an entirely new line. My hon. friend from South Renfrew is protesting against expenditures on account of war conditions. He is absolutely right and we all agree to that and we have curtailed expenditures. But, there are urgent cases like the present where the extension is to give communication to a large fishing industry. We are urging people to catch more fish and that large industry has increased its output for the benefit of the people during the war. No Government can sit still and not do what is necessary in connection with the works that are already established. Some hon. gentleman states that the Government system does not amount to much. We have some 10,000 miles of telegraph service throughout Canada while the Great Northwestern Telegraph Company has 10,000; the Canadian Pacific Railway Telegraph Com-

pany, 14,000 and the Grand Trunk Pacific 5,000. We are in the business in about as large a way as any of them. The only difference is that the Government have to build these lines in sparsely settled districts where a private corporation would not extend their system. Would the hon. member for Carleton (Mr. Carvell) who is interested in a telephone company say that the Bell Telephone Company are not extending their line one mile during this war; but that they are taking the money that they might use for extensions and putting it into war bonds?

Mr. CARVELL: Our company are certainly extending their lines the least possible distance and we are putting every dollar we can get our hands on into war bonds or into contributions to the Patriotic Fund.

Mr. REID: The hon. gentleman has answered my question as I expected he would. He admits that they are extending their lines to the least possible extent and I tell him that the Government are doing the same, as was proved when the hon. member for Inverness complained that he had asked for 7½ miles of telegraphic line and that the minister had cut it in two.

Mr. CARVELL: The minister talks about his great system of 10,000 miles of telegraph and telephone lines. This is a system that was started to reach parts of the country that could not possibly be reached by any ordinary business organization. They had to go to the Yukon, twelve or fourteen years ago and that takes in 1,000 miles. They had to go to Labrador to facilitate the navigation of the river St. Lawrence, and that takes in 2,000 or 3,000 miles, and they had to go down the north shore of the St. Lawrence for the same reason. Years ago they constructed a line from Chatham to Point Escuminac, which also was necessitated by the requirements of navigation. But that is a different principle altogether. That does not get you away from the fact that the hon. gentleman, on the eve of an election, is expending over a quarter of a million dollars for telephone lines that are not needed. Do you tell me that it is necessary for the industries of this country, for the carrying on of the war, or for the carrying on of the affairs of the country, that this Government should expend $3,000 to extend a little telephone line in the constituency of my hon. friend from Kent? It is a most wonderful thing how they have got along there for fifty or seventy-five years without a telephone line. It is a most wonderful thing that any of the telephone companies in New Brunswick have not heard about this. It is a remarkable thing that they have carried on their business down there without a telephone line, and that just on the eve of an election my hon. friend wants to spend $3,000 in order that the hon. member for Kent may obtain a few votes. That is what we object to. If the Government telephone system were a real business proposition from which they were expected to pay interest on the investment it would be a different thing. But we know that these are not business propositions. We know that they never expect to get a cent of revenue from the investment. We have the admission that they spend $600,000 or $700,000 a year in getting a revenue amounting to about one-third of that. But what I am saying now is only a bagatelle as compared with what ought to be said with reference to some other items in the estimates. A man would not know very much about what was real loyalty to his country who would stand up without protesting against the proposal of the Government to launch out into the expenditure of this enormous amount of money simply that there might be easy sledding for certain of his friends when the election comes on.

Mr. COPP: The acting Minister of Public Works did not answer my question in regard to the policy of the Government. He made the statement that this amount was being expended in that section of the country for the purpose of reaching the fishing establishments and giving the people telephonic communication with Chatham and elsewhere in Kent and Northumberland. Is it proposed to extend that system to any other localities in New Brunswick?

I know of farmers who have left their places because they could not get telephone connection. It is as important to farmers to have telephone communication as it is to fishermen, and if the policy laid down with regard to this line is right, it would be equally correct to give assistance to agricultural communities in the outlying settlements of the different provinces. If I can say to my constituents that the Government will assist them in establishing telephonic lines of communication with the more populous centres, they will consider it a great advantage. Leaving aside the general question of public ownership, I can see no reason why one section should get this advantage and assistance and other sections be denied it.

Mr. REID: The policy of the Government is only to extend certain lines that are in existence, not to build new lines in new localities.

Mr. COPP: What is the difference between extending an old line ten miles into a new district and building ten miles of line in a new district?

Mr. REID: The difference is that to adopt such a policy would involve a very large expenditure. These are small amounts to extend some of the present lines a few miles.

Mr. CARVELL: How many phones does the minister anticipate placing on this ten or twelve miles of line, and what will be the estimated cost and the revenue?

Mr. REID: I shall have to get that information between now and eight o'clock.

Mr. CARVELL: Is this line to be operated on the same principle and under the same conditions as the line in Nova Scotia, which is that there will be no such thing as a man renting a phone, but that a phone will be placed in somebody's place of business or residence, and people will go in and pay a certain toll? I understand that this line will extend about 70 miles to Chatham. If this system is to be adopted, does it mean that the same charge will be made for all points on that 70 miles, and, if so, what will that rate be?

Mr. REID: That is a very reasonable question and I shall procure the information before eight o'clock.

Mr. CARVELL: I may say that I am absolutely opposed to the whole system and feel like criticising each item and getting all possible information. I think it necessary that the people should have some of this information in order that they may realize what an awful system is being imposed on them for what, in my judgment, is purely a political reason. I shall continue to ask questions and I hope the minister will realize that I am doing it only from a sense of duty.

Mr. REID: The information I have before me is what it is usual for the minister to have in passing these estimates, but of course there may be questions that call for fuller information and I shall have the proper official here at eight o'clock. It is better to have the items criticised because in that way information may be forthcoming which will be valuable to the minister in respect to either expenditure or operation. I want the hon. member to feel that I am not withholding any information.

Mr. CARVELL: As the minister is in the happy position of not having any information, of course he cannot withhold it. If this discussion has done nothing but reveal the condition of affairs existing in the county of Inverness, and if it produces a remedy for that condition of affairs and places this system in such a position that it will not be an absolute political machine but will be of some benefit to the public, the afternoon will not have been spent in vain.

At six o'clock the Committee took recess.

After Recess.

The Committee resumed at eight o'clock.

Telegraph and telephone lines—New Brunswick—Chatham—Escuminac and Point Sapin telephone line—extension to Kouchibouguac, $3,000.

Mr. CARVELL: What rates are to be charged on this line, and what is the expected revenue?

Mr. REID: I will hand my hon. friend an extract from the report of the Department of Public Works; it will give him some information on that.

Mr. CARVELL: On the Escuminac line the expenditure last year was $1,692.83 and the revenue $968.20. What is the anticipated revenue from the proposed extension to Kouchibouguac?

Mr. REID: Two hundred dollars a year over cost of operation is expected.

Mr. CARVELL: Does that mean $200 over the annual expenditure for keeping the line in repair—replacements, betterments and maintenance?

Mr. REID: Two hundred dollars a year over the cost of maintenance. The man who is looking after the other line will keep this one in repair.

Quebec—Quebec county telephone lines, $2,400; Dorchester county telephone lines, $3,500.

Mr. BOULAY: In making appropriations for telephone lines the Government has evidently forgotten a part of the country which is in great need of that service. I refer to that part of Quebec extending fro... Matane to Gaspé, along the south shore of the St. Lawrence. This part of the province is settled chiefly by fishermen, whose only communication during the winter is by telegraph. In this district, which covers an area

of about 200 miles, lumber mills are being established and business is going to improve, but very likely the people there will never have the benefit of a railroad. Part of this district is in the county of Rimouski and part in the county of Gaspé. I hope the Government will bear my remarks in mind and make an appropriation next year with a view to improving the means of communication afforded to these people, who, as it were, are buried under the snow nearly seven months in the year. I wish to call the attention of the minister also to the condition of the Matapedia road. Some improvements have been effected, but this year the item for the necessary work has been entirely forgotten. The Matapedia road is a very important one; it is much used by travellers; automobiles and teams pass over it when going from Quebec to New Brunswick. It is the only road in the Matapedia valley leading into Campbellton. It is in a very dangerous condition.

Mr. BRADBURY: Does the Dominion Government keep up that road?

Mr. BOULAY: Yes, it was built by the Federal Government. There should be an appropriation this year to put that road in a safe condition.

Mr. BRADBURY: When was the road built by the Federal Government?

Mr. BOULAY: I think it was before Confederation. If no appropriation is made this year for making repairs to that road, I hope the minister will see that the matter is attended to next year.

This road should not be neglected. It is the only road we have. It should be widened. In some places it is only from twelve to fifteen feet wide, and travellers complain that in some parts the telegraph poles are right in the middle of the road. Steps should have been taken long ago to compel the Great Northwestern Telegraph Company to move those poles to one side of the road. This should be done as soon as is convenient.

Mr. REID: I will make a note of the hon. member's remarks and will take the matter up with the department.

Mr. PROULX: Are these telephone lines in Quebec and Dorchester counties to be used in connection with the operation of the Transcontinental railway?

Mr. REID: No, they are just for the use of the people living in the locality.

Mr. PROULX: Why this discrimination? Why is the Government building telephone lines in only two counties of Quebec?

Mr. REID: If the hon. member will look over a list of the lines in Quebec he will see that there are telephone or telegraph lines in many constituencies of the province along both shores. Away down along the north shore, where neither railway companies nor private companies have lines, the Government have had to build lines. I speak of the north shore at points such as Tadoussac and Chicoutimi, where telephonic communication is required for the protection of shipping and to enable the fishermen to do business. That is the only communication the people have with the city of Quebec.

Mr. PROULX: The Charlevoix, Chicoutimi and Saguenay districts are very sparsely populated, but Quebec and Dorchester are old counties with dense population, and in many counties in Quebec there are private lines with connection with the Bell Telephone Company. In my county there is the Bell Telephone Company and two private telephone lines which have connections with the Bell.

Mr. REID: The district in which the hon. member lives is well settled, and the Bell Telephone Company has lines all over that locality. But in the district we have spoken of there is no telephone system and we are merely extending the Government line.

Mr. TOBIN: Do I understand the minister to say there are no telephone companies in the county of Dorchester?

Mr. REID: Not in the locality referred to.

Mr. TOBIN: If this is going to be the policy of the Government as regards the south shore of the river, I may say that Dorchester county has a telephone line that runs through all the parishes.

Mr. SEVIGNY: I know that this item for telephone lines for Quebec county is required for the parishes of Tewkesbury, Notre-Dame des Laurentides, Lac Beauport, Lac St. Charles and another parish the name of which I do not remember. I know personally that in that part of Quebec county there is no telephone at all and no telegraph, and it is distant from any railway. It is only fair to the people of those parishes that they should be afforded some means of communication with the rest of civilization. It is true, as has just been mentioned by my hon. friend from

Richmond and Wolfe (Mr. Tobin) that many parishes in my county have telephone lines which are giving a very good service, but it is also true that in four new parishes in the upper part of the county, St. Cyprien, St. Louis, St. Abdon and St. Luc, there is neither telephonic nor telegraphic communication, and they are about fifteen miles from a railway. Those parishes were visited by officers of the Department of of Public Works who made a very favourable report on the proposed work.

Mr. TOBIN: When did the minister receive the report referred to?

Mr. REID: March 10, 1917.

Mr. A. K. MACLEAN: Are those parishes in Dorchester county well settled agricultural communities?

Mr. SEVIGNY: No, they are new parishes.

Mr. A. K. MACLEAN: The mere fact that a district has no telegraph system, no telephone system and is fifteen miles from a railway, is not good enough ground to warrant the Government incurring an expenditure in order to instal a telephone system. There are scores of places in Canada much less favourably situated than are these parishes in Dorchester county. These votes for telephone lines, with which we have been dealing this afternoon and with which we shall probably be dealing with all evening, are a serious matter. This is a departure from what has been the settled policy of this country for many years, and it looks as if we were about to embark upon the general construction, in several provinces of Canada, of telephone systems. It is quite true that, at one stage of our history and at certain places in Canada, there was justification for the expenditure of money to give telephonic and telegraphic communication to certain isolated parts of a community or of a province. That day has passed. There is not a place, in Nova Scotia at least, in which the Government should be operators of a telephone system. We have several private companies operating there which are controlled, as to rates, by public utility boards. Every year many farmers' telephone lines are being installed, and it seems to me it is time for the Government to go out of the business. Instead of constructing new lines, they should dispose of those they now have.

We should know whether or not this is the settled policy of the Government. If it were merely the construction of a few miles of telephone lines, I could understand it, and it might not be objectionable, but starting, as the Government is this year, with all this proposed construction, is it not likely to grow? If there is one enterprize in the world in which a government—the Dominion Government, at least—should not enter, it is the telephone system. It would be far better to give small bonuses to local companies to assist them in the construction of telephone lines in certain communities, and then we are done with it.

Mr. REID: I do not think the hon. gentleman is quite fair in this matter. He is trying to lead the committee to believe we are adopting a new policy in building telephone or telegraph lines in Canada.

Mr. A. K. MACLEAN: It looks that way.

Mr REID: And he suggested that, instead of operating the line, it would be much better to give a subsidy to some other company.

Mr. A. K. MACLEAN: I did not urge the giving of a subsidy, but I said that would be a better policy.

Mr. REID: I believe the Government would be glad to hand over the lines to any company that would agree to operate them. These lines are not built by the Government for the purpose of making money, but to accommodate the people in these outlying districts where they have no communication with the outside world, except by wire. I suppose it is 30 or 40 years since the Government started building telephone lines in these outlying places. There is no doubt that these lines had to be built, and from 1896 until 1911, when the hon. gentleman was on this side of the House, that was exactly the policy carried out. In these districts where they have no telegraph communication new telegraph lines were constructed. We have 11,000 or 12,000 miles of lines throughout the Dominion, and I venture to say, that 5,000 or 6,000 miles were built when the hon. gentleman occupied a seat on this side, and he voted for every item and never raised an objection to the policy. We are simply carrying on the extension which is necessary this year, at the least possible expenditure. We have in Canada many telegraph and telephone companies, some large corporations like the Bell Telephone Company and the New Brunswick Telephone Company, and some rural telephone lines;

and I venture to say that there is not one system, either telegraph or telephone, which has not extended its lines many miles during the last year, and will continue to do so every year. The government system was inaugurated perhaps thirty or forty years ago and since then every government has simply been extending those lines, or building lines in newly-developed localities where you could not possibly get a private corporation to venture. During this session we are only adding a few miles to some of these lines, where the former Minister of Public Works, when preparing his estimates, felt it absolutely necessary to take some action at the present time.

Mr. CARVELL: Will the minister tell me what lines he is extending in Dorchester county, and what lines the Government now own, which they think it their imperative duty to extend, especially since the Dorchester election?

Mr. REID: I stated that the Government were simply following out the policy of extending some of the present lines, and building in a new country, where there was a population with no telephone system. These few miles of lines which are being constructed in Dorchester county are in a part of the country only partly opened up, where there is now no telephone communication.

Mr. A. K. MACLEAN: This apparently means the adoption of a new Government policy in respect of telephones. I am quite aware that in the past the Government constructed many miles of telegraph system, and have been operating the same for many years. In many instances I have no doubt it is very desirable indeed that the Government should do this. I think I may also safely say that, in past years, when construction and extensions were made they were quite necessary. Extensions were made in districts which were very thinly populated and where it was not possible to get private companies to go. But there never was a time when the estimates disclosed expenditures for the construction of 50 or more extensions of telephone lines. The most that Parliament ever voted in any one year would be very few in number. The minister goes into Dorchester county, where there was not a telephone line owned by the Government. I should think that that is one of the oldest-settled counties in Canada. Surely there would be private companies quite willing to go and serve the parishes to which the hon. Minister of Inland Revenue refers. If the Government once starts putting in a few miles in Dorchester county in one year, similar demands will come from every county in Canada. This is a new policy.

Mr. REID: I do not agree with the hon. gentleman. It may be that the construction of a telephone system is a new policy adopted by this Government. It may be the previous government did not adopt the telephone system when they were building lines. The cost of a new line would be the same, whether it was a telegraph line or a telephone line. There is no doubt in my mind which of the two I would instal. Any person can operate the telephone system, you can have a great many people using it, and they can talk from their own houses; but if you build a telegraph line, parties must go to the office, even though it be miles away, to have their messages sent by the operator, and they do not know whether they are sent in the right way or not.

Mr. COPP: How many inhabitants are there in those parishes in Dorchester county?

Mr. REID: Probably the Minister of Inland Revenue could answer that better than I can. My hon. friend (Mr. A. K. Maclean) has also laid stress on the fact that this is an old-settled county. The hon. member for Victoria (Sir Sam Hughes) made the statement to-day that there are parts of the province of Ontario which are very sparsely settled, and there is not a private corporation which would think for a minute of building a telephone line in them. In the county of Hastings, 100 miles from Belleville, there are very few people. If you asked the Bell Telephone Company to put a line there, they would laugh at you. You could not even get a rural line started, because there are so few people. Many years ago the Government adopted the policy of building these telegraph and telephone lines, and what we are doing now is simply carrying out that policy. The hon. member for Inverness (Mr. Chisholm) told us here to-day that his application for extensions had been cut in two. My hon. friend from Northumberland (Mr. Loggie) has been pressing for the line from Chatham. All the items before us have been urged by members on both sides of the House and are in the estimates after thorough investigation.

Mr. A. K. MACLEAN: And you will have more next year.

Mr. REID: If my hon. friend can get the members for Cape Breton, where these Government lines are, to say they will take them over and operate them to the satisfaction of the public, so far as I am concerned I would be prepared to recommend to the Government to hand them over.

Mr. CARVELL: Would the minister be prepared to do that in New Brunswick?

Mr. REID: Will my hon. friend take this line?

Mr. CARVELL: Will you make the offer?

Mr. REID: Now that the line is built—

Mr. CARVELL: If the minister will make the offer I will be only too happy to submit it to the company.

Mr. REID: The Government is building this line from Chatham down to Mr. Loggie's fishery industry. If the hon. member will take his line and pay five per cent on the investment, and operate the line to the satisfaction of the public—

Mr. CARVELL: That is another thing.

Mr. REID: The line will cost about $3,000. We expect a revenue of $200 over and above operating expenses. This is more than five per cent on the investment. I am willing to recommend that the Government accept less than that, but my hon. friend will not take it.

Mr. CARVELL: The minister is getting away from the question now. He is talking about giving over those Nova Scotia lines to somebody. Will he hand over the New Brunswick lines to the New Brunswick Telephone Company, if the company undertakes to operate them?

Mr. REID: I have given my answer.

Mr. TOBIN: Has the work of building these lines been started?

Mr. REID: Not yet.

Mr. TOBIN: The county of Dorchester is one of the oldest counties in the province of Quebec. There are about eighteen or twenty municipalities, or parishes, in the county, and the Minister of Inland Revenue says there are only four parishes which have no telephone system. He knows very well that if it were not for the promises he made to his friends in the election of February last the Government would not be installing telephone systems there to-day.

Mr. SEVIGNY: I made only one promise in my election.

[Mr A. K. Maclean.]

Mr. TOBIN: You made a great many promises, and you cannot carry them out.

Mr. REID: Did my hon. friend ever make any promises when he was running an election?

Mr. TOBIN: None that I could not carry out. In the carrying out of these promises, an engineer was sent down there, and he made a report on 10th March, just a few weeks after the election. Now they are coming forward with an estimate for $3,500. If it is going to be the policy of the Government to build telephone lines in all the rural municipalities in the province of Quebec I have nothing to say; but, if these lines are only being built to fulfil election promises, I think this item should be struck out.

Mr. REID: It is not being done to redeem an election promise.

Mr. TOBIN: The election was held on 4th February last, and the engineer's report is dated 10th March. The Government is asking everybody to save, to cut down expenses, to tighten up their belts, to eat less, to give money to patriotic funds, and so on, yet they carry out an election promise to the extent of $3,500 on one item in one county. The hon. gentleman who represents that county knows very well that they have local telephone companies, and that the farmers could organize under the laws of the province of Quebec and get their charter at a cost of about $10, and could operate their own local companies. The minister knows perfectly well that if it were not for the election we would not have this item in the Estimates to-day.

Mr. PROULX: What is the estimated revenue of those lines in Dorchester?

Mr. REID: It is estimated that the revenue will be about equal to the operating expenses.

Mr. PROULX: Are they to be operated by Government employees, or on a commission basis?

Mr. REID: By Government employees.

Mr. TOBIN: What is the population of those parishes?

Mr. SEVIGNY: There are about 75 families in the parish of St. Louis, and, as my hon. friend knows, the families in the province of Quebec are large.

Mr. McKENZIE: Are they so large that each family would require more than one telephone?

Mr. SEVIGNY: I don't know. There are about 50 families in the parish of St. Cyprien. The only way they can have communication with the rest of the world is by means of this telephone system. They have no telegraph lines. They are really pioneers. This is a new part of the county, about five or six miles from the boundary line.

Mr. BOIVIN: How long have those new parishes been established in your county?

Mr. SEVIGNY: Four parishes were established about five or six years ago. They are new settlements.

Mr. CARVELL: We have new parishes in the province of New Brunswick along the line of the Transcontinental. If my hon. friend from Rimouski (Mr. Boulay) were here he could tell you all about them, because two or three days after the election he went down and ordered them to change the names of some of the stations along the line. He knows we have parishes there with hundreds of families, instead of 75 families.

Mr. SEVIGNY: On the Transcontinental line?

Mr. CARVELL: No, away in the wilderness. Those men get telephonic communication through their own energy. The idea of asking the Government to come in and build a few miles of telephone line, in order to implement an election pledge, is something very small indeed, so small that the Lord knows what this country is coming to. There is nothing to it except to carry out pledges made in the past and try to get votes in the future.

I felt that my hon. friend the Acting Minister of Public Works (Mr. Reid) would be up against a stone wall this afternoon. I have a good deal of sympathy with him. He is carrying this thing along and he is exercising a great deal of ingenuity—and no man possesses more ingenuity than he. But when he tried to get down to principles, I knew he was going to get into trouble. All of yesterday and this afternoon he was talking about an extension of existing lines. Because I happen to have some little connection with a telephone company in New Brunswick he put a staggerer to me. He grinned clear to the back of his neck when he asked me if we would extend our lines, and I said: "To the least possible extent." He said: "That is exactly what we are doing; all we are doing is extending existing lines." But now we find that he is starting out after new business entirely. There never was a government line there. But the trouble is that the Minister of Inland Revenue wanted to get elected last year and he promised everything—telephones, telegraphs, bulls, rams, and everything else imaginable, and he got them. The bulls and rams are not there now, or they are not in the condition they were in when they went there. It is anything in the world to get votes. If the minister will own up—admit the whole story—I think we will let this item go through.

Mr. REID: Carried.

Mr. CARVELL: If the minister will own up like a man, if he will simply say that he is carrying out the pledges made by the Minister of Inland Revenue to get some votes and that he is ashamed of the whole thing—as the whole party is ashamed of it—we might make an exception in this case and let the item go through. Personally, I felt that he was up against a wall, that he would not be able to carry this out in principle. And he is not through yet; this is only the beginning.

Mr. OLIVER: The minister hardly states the case correctly when he says that these votes are merely a continuation of the long-established policy of the Government. It has been a long-established policy of the Government to give telegraphic communication to outlying points strategically situated for the transaction of business or the promotion of settlement, or for other reasons of public policy, but it never was any part of the policy of the Government to provide purely local telephonic communication. That is a new development, the policy of this present Government, and, I judge, of this session of Parliament. There is no part of the country where the policy of the extension of telegraph lines has been pushed more than in the part of the country I represent. Telegraph lines were extended to the Peace river country many years ago with a view to assist in carrying on the trade then existing and for the development of settlement which was then coming in. There is no doubt that the building of that particular telegraph line, as well as most of those telegraph lines which have been built out into that new country, has very well justified the enterprise that placed it there. But in the Peace River country the settlers are providing their own local telephonic communication. A group of farmers organize and provide poles and wires linked up with points where there is telegraphic communi-

cation. This they do at their own expense. I do not see any particular reason why, if the pioneer settlers of the Peace river are able to protect their own interests to that degree, the pioneer settlers in Dorchester should not do exactly the same thing. I do not wish to raise any complaint against the giving of advantage to these settlers simply because they are new settlers. That is a reason why they should get advantages if they are not so situated that they can be relieved by the establishment of local lines which are well within their own resources. That is the difference between the policy that has been pursued and the policy that is now being instituted. If the Government proposes to take upon its shoulders the burden of supplying local telephonic communication to every section of the country throughout the Dominion or to every locality in which the people have sufficient pull with the Government to secure its attention, it is a most objectionable policy, and I protest that it is not in accordance with the policy of telegraph line construction that has prevailed in the past.

Mr. A. K. MACLEAN: Would the Minister of Inland Revenue inform the committee of the size of the parishes in Dorchester county and state the distance between the present established telephone lines and the most remote parish which is to be served by the new lines?

Mr. SEVIGNY: The parish of St. Louis is about ten miles from the parish of Ste. Rose where they have a telephone line.

Mr. A. K. MACLEAN: How many people are in that parish?

Mr. SEVIGNY: Seventy-five families.

Mr. A. K. MACLEAN: In one settled community?

Mr. SEVIGNY: Spread over. It is a newly colonized district situated about five miles from the Maine border. The parish of St. Cyprien is about six miles from the parish of St. Louis. I think there are about 50 families of pioneers there. The parish of St. Luc has just been opened up; they have had a priest for a month only. There are about 25 or 30 families there.

Mr. CARVELL: How far are they from the Transcontinental railway?

Mr. SEVIGNY: These people are forty miles from the Transcontinental railway.

Mr. CARVELL: What railway is nearest to them?

[Mr. Oliver.]

Mr. SEVIGNY: The Quebec Central. They are about 15 or 20 miles from it.

Mr. SINCLAIR: The system of telephones grew up in the province of Nova Scotia in this way: Many years ago the fishermen wanted communication along the coast in order to get ship news, news of wrecks and of the location of bait, and the Government built these telephone lines in Cape Breton for the accommodation of fishermen in outlying places. But the present Government has embarked in the telephone business and has connected the telegraph lines with districts by telephones.

Is the minister going to extend that to other places? I have in my constituency a number of places of that kind which have no telephone lines and where the people would find it difficult to build lines because of the expense. One or two of these places correspond closely with the description given by the hon. Minister of Inland Revenue (Mr. Sevigny). Will the minister do the same thing for the outlying districts of Guysborough?

Mr. REID: If the hon. member will send in an application, I will promise to give it my serious consideration if he will promise not to accuse me of doing it for political purposes.

Mr. MICHAUD: I wish to direct attention to the conditions in connection with the telephone line along the International railway which was purchased by the Government. It is about 115 miles in length and about 900 families live along it. It is almost impossible to obtain the use of the line, as we are informed by the operators that it belongs to the Government and not to the settlers. I have tried to use it myself without success. If the minister will telegraph to-morrow morning to the agents along that railway that they are to permit the settlers to use the telephone line, he will greatly please and benefit them.

Mr. REID: That line would come under the Railway Department, not under the Public Works Department. I will mention it to the Minister of Railways, but I should suggest that the hon. member should write to the minister. Of course it is quite essential that the line should be under the control of the train dispatcher if it is used for the operation of the trains.

Mr. CARVELL: There is only one accommodation train a day each way, and the line could not be used for more than half an hour by the railway.

Mr. MICHAUD: As to the operators being busy, very often they are not. The line is not properly operated, and the trains are delayed for hours every day, and never reach their destinations on time. The operators as a rule would have ample time to help the public in this matter.

Mr. CARVELL: That is Government operation of railways.

Mr. NESBITT: Upon what principle is the minister acting in establishing telephone lines in a community such as that described by the hon. Minister of Inland Revenue (Mr. Sevigny) in Dorchester, where there are 75 families within ten miles of another line, 50 families within six miles of another line, and 25 families within a distance which was not stated? There is not another place in Canada that would ask to have a telephone line built under such circumstances. In every part of Ontario that I know of the people
9 p.m. themselves establish these lines, paying the entire cost of construction and operation. As a Parliament, we are supposed to use every section of the country alike, and I should like to know the principle acted on in this case. It looks absurd on the face of it.

Mr. REID: I explained that it is a new colony that has gone into this territory, and this is to give the people communication with the outside world.

Mr. A. K. MACLEAN: Why do they not build it themselves?

Mr. REID: These people are starting a new colony and they have not the means.

Mr. A. K. MACLEAN: How do you know?

Mr. REID: The hon. member has heard the Minister of Inland Revenue.

Mr. A. K. MACLEAN: He did not say they were without means.

Mr. REID: He said they were settlers just going in to open up this new territory, and as a rule they are not very flush.

Mr. NESBITT: I understood that Dorchester was an old settled county.

Mr. REID: Part of it.

Mr. SEVIGNY: The lower part; this is a new part.

Mr. NESBITT: Every county may have some part that is not settled, but that is no reason why we should establish telephone lines in it.

Mr. A. K. MACLEAN: Then the pioneer of Dorchester referred to by the minister is not the pioneer of fifty or a hundred years ago. These settlers are probably the children of well-to-do people in the county of Dorchester who are going on new land.

Mr. SEVIGNY: Oh, no.

Mr. A. K. MACLEAN: The Minister of Inland Revenue ought to be ashamed to go to the Government and ask them to spend $3,500 on this telephone line. He should show a better example to his colleagues, to the country and to Parliament, and should ask to have the amount withdrawn now. It is nothing but looting the treasury by means of an Act of Parliament.

Mr. SEVIGNY: The Minister of Inland Revenue is not ashamed at all to ask for that amount in the estimates. If the junior member for Halifax (Mr. A. K. Maclean) will look at the estimates presented to this House for the last six years, he will notice that there never was $50 in the estimates to be spent in the county of Dorchester.

Mr. A. K. MACLEAN: That has nothing to do with the question.

Mr. SEVIGNY: It has something to do with the question. I am asking that this amount be voted for my county, because it is necessary to give accommodation to the people—unfortunately, poor people, in four new parishes that have no telephones or telegraphs—who are fifteen miles from a railway line and who are making every possible sacrifice in an effort to develop this new district. They are certainly entitled to some encouragement. I am sure that many people who voted against me in January last will be surprised that there is such strong opposition on the part of Liberal members to the making of this appropriation for my county. This Government is asked for this appropriation, not only by my friends, but by the priests, by the Liberal leaders, by everybody. It is only fair that the people should be given this accommodation.

Mr. A. K. MACLEAN: It does not matter if everybody in Dorchester county asked for these telephones. The minister would display more commendable qualities as a representative of the people if he had strength enough to say no to the people in his county who ask for this expenditure. A public representative should learn to say no; it is easy enough to say yes. Does the

Minister of Inland Revenue attempt to justify this vote on the ground that during the last six years no public expenditures have been made in Dorchester county?

Mr. SEVIGNY: No, not at all.

Mr. A. K. MACLEAN: The hon. gentleman said a moment ago that no public money had been expended in his county during the last six years. I understand that a great number of cattle for breeding purposes were sent to Dorchester county, and that somebody ran away with them. That must have involved an expenditure of public money; therefore, there was some expenditure in Dorchester county within the last few years. I am afraid the real reason of it all is, as the minister inadvertently stated a few moments ago, that he wants some money spent in Dorchester county, and it might as well be for telephones as for anything else.

Mr. CARVELL: Two very vicious principles have been enunciated by the Minister of Inland Revenue in his brief remarks. First, he says that he is not ashamed to ask for this vote because during the last six years not $50 has been expended in his county. Second, he says that the people want this appropriation. Of course they want it. That is what I have been trying to fight against for some years. The people "want"—and as long as they have a paternal government that will give them what they want, they will continue to make demands. No man knows that better than the Minister of Inland Revenue. He stated that no public money has been expended in his constituency. Well, no public money has been expended in my constituency during the last six years, unless for necessary repairs to the three public buildings that we have in that county. There has been no new work. I have not asked for any; I would not ask for anything unless it was absolutely necessary. Although I do not represent a constituency of saints, I will never go to my constituents and ask them to vote against the Government because public money has not been spent in the constituency. No public money was spent in my constituency when I supported the Government; I could never ask them to vote for me on that account. The acting Minister of Public Works says something about the St. John Valley railway. Yes, the Government gave a subsidy to the St. John Valley railway, and their political friends stole $100,000 at the very first crack, in one lump, a few days before the provincial election of 1912. I do not want public money simply because of a desire that public money shall be expended. I commence to see light in this matter. The Minister of Agriculture (Mr. Burrell) sat here all last evening and all to-day; his colleagues from his own province were here, waiting and wondering when these infernal Grits would ever stop talking. The Minister of Agriculture has $200,000 in the estimates for telephones; his colleague, the Minister of Inland Revenue, had one hundred bulls in his constituency after the last election. As Gadsby says, he converted a lot of them into benevolent neutrals, in order that they might be more docile in the yoke, and in order that they might work in the fields. When I see these two hon. gentlemen working together, not for the propagation of live stock, but for the prevention of the propagation of live stock—well, the plot thickens. The conspiracy is so absolutely patent that I think we should have some explanation from the Minister of Agriculture.

Mr. McKENZIE: The member for Carleton suggests that there was an exchange of bulls for telephones; perhaps there was. That brings out another reason why the county of Dorchester should be more in touch with civilization; if officers of the law could have been speedily informed about these bulls, perhaps the animals would not have been stolen. I have already drawn the attention of the former Minister of Public Works to the matter of entering upon new expenditures. At page 4354 of Hansard, I said:

> When the war broke out we in Nova Scotia were willing to give up all our public works. We had large votes in the Estimates, and even before the war began, on account of the fall in the revenue, we were advised that we should cease pressing for improvements that had been promised, or from pressing for the expenditure of money that had already been voted. We were told by the minister that large expenditures had to be dropped; that practically all public expenditures that were not absolutely necessary were to cease. Accordingly, we have not been pressing the minister for any expenditure, although some of these works are very necessary.

The hon. gentleman accepted that as being the correct position. He answered as follows:

> Mr. Rogers: If my hon. friend, who says that I am undertaking new work, will only look at the item he will see that there is a reduction in it of over $2,500,000, which is an evidence that we are adhering to our policy of economy during war time, even in such important matters as the great harbours of this country. The harbours enumerated here are national harbours. Before the outbreak of the war large contracts had been let for the pur-

pose of improving the harbours to meet the trade requirements of the country, and the amounts here asked for are simply to carry out the contracts that were then entered into.

The minister told us then that any large vote he was asking for was simply for the carrying out of contracts to which the country had already committed itself, and that nothing really new was being entered upon. I read this for the information of the acting Minister of Public Works, so that he may see the real attitude which the gentleman responsible for the estimates took when this question was put up to him.

Saskatchewan and Alberta telegraph and telephone lines—extension of Lac La Biche telephone line, $1,200.

Mr. OLIVER: To what point is this extension being made?

Mr. REID: This is required to extend the Government telephone line from Lac La Biche mission to Lac La Biche railway station, a distance of approximately eight miles.

Mr. OLIVER: Is there a probability that the work will be done this fall?

Mr. REID: I can give the hon. member only the same answer that I have given to others. I have given instructions to the deputy minister to proceed with these works immediately now that the votes are passed. He tells me that, if possible, he will go ahead and carry out this work at once.

Mr. OLIVER: I would urge, to give this extension precedence for this fall if possible, because there is no telegraph line to Lac La Biche. The railway company have a telephone system along their line, but there is no means of the public reaching Lac La Biche by wire except over the Government line which does not reach Lac La Biche station, which is the place at which the business is being done. At present the Government line as far as Lac La Biche mission is practically useless; it is so many miles of line, which is of no value for the transaction of the business of the district. That condition will continue until the extension of eight miles is made so that the present line will be able to transact the business of the town at the railroad station. In the interest of the public and of the Government revenue. I would respectfully urge that the work be done this fall, so that we shall have the benefit of that extension during the winter.

Mr. REID: I have just given the deputy minister instructions, and he and the superintendent of the telegraph service, who is also here, will pay special attention to the matter. Instructions will be given to-morrow to have the work proceeded with.

Saskatchewan and Alberta—shifting line to roadways, $8,000.

Mr. CARVELL: Will the minister explain this item?

Mr. REID: This amount is asked for by the superintendent of the telegraph service for the purpose of shifting the telegraph lines from the farm lands to the roadways. The sum of $5,000 is required for Saskatchewan and the balance of $3,000 for Alberta. The lines were run through before the surveys of that country were made and they are all on the farmers' lands.

Mr. CARVELL: Are these telegraph or telephone lines?

Mr. REID: Telegraph lines.

St. Paul de Metis—Durlingville telegraph line —extension to Beaver crossing, $4,500.

Mr. OLIVER: From what point and to what point is this extension being made?

Mr. REID: From Durlingville to Beaver crossing on Cold lake, a distance of twenty-six miles.

Mr. OLIVER: Beaver crossing, I would think, is the crossing of Beaver river, which is some little distance from Cold lake. I am anxious to know if the intention is to extend the line to Cold lake or only to the crossing of the Beaver river.

Mr. REID: On the plan it is marked "Extension to Beaver crossing, 26 miles." How much further would it be to Cold lake?

Mr. OLIVER: I think it is four or five miles from the crossing of the Beaver river to Cold lake. It is not a great distance. It is, of course, very desirable to have the telegraph line as far as the crossing of the Beaver river, but if it were intended to put it through to Cold lake, that would be still more desirable, and I am anxious to know if that is the intention.

Mr. REID: On this map, Cold lake and Beaver crossing are the same. Therefore, it would look as though the extension were to Cold lake.

Mr. McKENZIE: The minister promised me some information in regard to some of the items for telegraph and telephone lines in Nova Scotia which were passed without discussion. Perhaps he will tell me how he proposes to make those repairs to the Cape Breton telegraph system, for which he asks $3,400.

Mr. REID: The wire from Baddeck to the point of divergence is run on the telegraph poles, and new poles are provided for the rest of the distance.

Mr. McKENZIE: How far from the point of divergence do they run the telephone line?

Mr. REID: The line is seven and one-half miles.

Mr. McKENZIE: It goes on the poles already there for seven miles?

Mr. REID: Yes.

Mr. McKENZIE: Then there is a break in to the shore. How far does it run down the shore?

Mr. REID: It runs seven and one-half miles, and it starts off with telegraph poles, and come out two miles, and goes six miles behind the mountain to New Harris, so that would give eight miles of poles, and fifteen and one-half miles of wire.

Mr. McKENZIE: How far does that leave you from New Campbellton, which is further down the shore on the same line?

Mr. REID: I do not know that territory, and the deputy cannot inform me.

Mr. McKENZIE: I was not consulted about this matter, and I do not know whose plan the hon. minister has before him. This is all a very deserving settlement, but I do not see why make two bites of a cherry. If it is accommodating that settlement at all it should go right down to New Campbellton, and I hope the minister will attend to it.

Mr. REID: Is New Campbellton not already connected on the main line?

Mr. McKENZIE: There is a telegraph there, and if a telephone were within decent reach it would be a great accommodation.

Mr. REID: I can quite understand that, but the hon. gentleman will see that this other territory is not served at all.

Mr. McKENZIE: But it must be 20 miles from where it stops to New Campbellton, and no line between. I think the minister will likely extend it down there by and by. With reference to the expenditure of $3,400 for the obtaining of poles and for repairs, where is that being spent, and who has control of it?

[Mr. McKenzie.]

Mr. REID: I am informed that the poles are purchased from the farmers all along the line.

Mr. McKENZIE: It is a large system—the whole island of Cape Breton. What county is it in?

Mr. REID: There are poles scattered along the line all over the section—166 poles were purchased from farmers between Gillisville and the south side of East bay. From Eskasoni to Grand Narrows, 22 miles, 700 poles are required; from Grand Narrows to shunacadie, 240 poles, and they were purchased from the farmers in that section. From Big Bras d'Or to Englishtown, 14 miles, 450 poles are required; from Louisburg to Gabarus, 38; from Gabarus to Marion bridge, 50; from Gabarus to Enon, 165. Thus a total of 1,809 poles were purchased in 56½ miles, as I understand from the farmers in the several sections.

Mr. McKENZIE: Has the minister put an upset price on poles?

Mr. REID: Yes, $1.25 with long haulage, and $1 for short haulage.

Mr. McKENZIE: I am surprised to find that the poles from Gillesville to East Bay and Grand Narrows are all gone already. Those poles are only six or seven years old. On whose report are all the new poles coming in? It is a comparatively new line.

Mr. REID: I am told they are all spruce poles in that section, and the superintendent tells me that about seven years is the life of a spruce pole.

Mr. McKENZIE: Is there any particular report to the department for the necessity of these poles?

Mr. REID: Yes, there is a report from the lineman. There is no doubt the poles are in bad condition, for otherwise they would not renew them.

Mr. McKENZIE: The superintendent is present, and he will pardon me for being inquisitive about this thing. When we had this famous election there were poles taken out all the way from Baddeck up to bay St. Lawrence and allowed to rot on the wayside. I am anxious to have things done properly in my riding, and I am not in favour of encouraging a business of that kind. Who is to have charge of the business. Mr. Livingstone is the superintendent, and no friend of mine, and appointed by the present Administration. I believe he is a decent man, and I should like to know if

this work is to be put in under Mr. Livingstone. If so, every chap who thinks he is a ward heeler can get an order for telegraph poles, whether they are wanted or not.

Mr. REID: I am informed that between Washabuck Centre and Iona is about seven miles, and that Mr. Dunlop who is dead, was the line repairer at the time, and he ordered some poles without the authority of the department, but afterwards the poles were taken over. The poles were used on the line and there was no loss of any kind. There were not very many poles.

Mr. McKENZIE: Where were they used?

Mr. REID: Between Washabuck Centre and Grass pond. The poles I am referring to were the 309 poles.

Mr. McKENZIE: There was no telegraph line between Washabuck Centre and Grass Pond. The minister is providing for poles between Washabuck Centre and McKay's point. If you are going to Grass pond you would go in 11 miles. That is down within two miles of Iona station, and there is no telegraph there at all, so the minister is misinformed.

Mr. REID: I am only giving information as I have received it. The superintendent tells me there is a line between Washabuck Centre and Grass pond, that there are already seven offices on the line, and that those poles were used.

Mr. McKENZIE: Of course the minister does not know the geography of the district. You can start from Washabuck Centre and follow the shore all the way around to Grass pond. If there is a line there now, why is the minister providing for the first three miles from Washabuck Centre down to McKay's point, along the shore?

Mr. REID: Of course I do not know the geography. The superintendent tells me it is in the opposite direction, southwest of this line.

Mr. McKENZIE: Will the minister tell me where are the offices between Washabuck Centre and Iona, and who have them?

Mr. REID: The postmaster at Grass pond has one; then there are several by the name of McNeill who have offices.

Mr. McKENZIE: What has the minister to say about Mr. Lavingston whose particular business it would be to look after this work? Is it the intention that he should have charge of purchasing those poles and seeing that the work is properly done?

Mr. REID: The general repairers have charge of purchasing those poles. There are two in that section, one named Dunlop, and the other Joseph Logue.

Mr. McKENZIE: If you put the matter in charge of Joseph Logue, it would be well and honestly done.

Mr. A. W. CHISHOLM: I am informed that the Nova Scotia Telephone Company is going to build a line along the shore, parallel with the proposed line. If that be so, will the Government build its line along the same route?

Mr. REID: We have never heard of it. I will have the department make inquiries before we proceed with this work. Of course, it would be absurd to parallel another line.

British Columbia—Ashcroft-Barkerville telephone line—branch from 70-Mile House to Mount Olie, $9,000.

Mr. CARVELL: I think before we come to this we should have an explanation from the minister on what certainly is a new policy to a very great extent at least. I have before me a return which was brought down a few days ago containing a copy of the papers with reference to the Government of the Dominion building competing telephone lines in British Columbia paralleling lines of the Okanagan Telephone Company already in operation. Up to the present time the Government has been justifying the expenditure of those comparatively large amounts of money on the ground that the lines were being constructed in out-of-the-way districts, putting the people of those districts into communication with the rest of the world, and that it was impossible for such communication to be established unless the Government came to the rescue. I thought he strained it to the breaking point in dealing with the county of Dorchester. We all know conditions there, and the minister did not try to explain it at all. He simply threw himself on the mercy of the House and said, "For God's sake put this thing through." We have an entirely different condition of affairs in the province of British Columbia. The minister may say the idea is to give telephonic communication to outlying settlers, but before he does so I want to point out a few things which appear in this return, so that he will not stumble too far into it. We find there has been a genuine competition going on in the province of British Columbia between a well-established company, known as the Okanagan Telephone Company, and the Government. The

question was, which was going to win out. Of course the inevitable happened—the Government won out, because the Okanagan Telephone Company had to furnish their own money and run the line as a business proposition, and could not compete with the Government, which was throwing in money at the rate of $25,000 in the first year, and in 1915-16, $97,000, and it is now up to $200,000, and no man on earth could tell where it would be if things were unfortunately allowed to continue for three or four years longer. I find from the statement made by the local superintendent, Mr. W. H. Stevens, that the system of the Okanagan Telephone Company comprises about 138 miles, and consists of trunk lines built to connect nine local exchanges. These exchanges are located at Salmon Arm, Enderby, Armstrong, Vernon, Lumby, Kelowna, Peachland, Summerland and Penticton. The Government system comprises about 1,300 miles, and has been constructed for the purpose of affording telephone service to the widely-scattered settlements throughout the region, while incidentally operating six local exchanges located at Nicola, Merrit, Princeton, Hedley, Keremeos and Chase. Then there came a fight between Enderby and Vernon, I think, and in some cases for nearly 100 miles—I am not exactly sure as to the mileage, but for a long distance in any event—the Government lines and the company lines were parallel, and, as if that was not bad enough, the Government actually built another line parallel to the company line.

Mr. REID: How long was that?

Mr. CARVELL: Somewhere about fifteen or twenty miles.

Mr. REID: Is it not the other way? Did not the company build after the Government line?

Mr. CARVELL: No, the company built first and the Government line was built afterwards. It ran into 1916 and the matter was referred to the Minister of Agriculture. He took the very wise course of handing it back to the local superintendent. He said that the superintendent was on the ground and he knew the conditions better. But there was a recommendation by the Conservative Association. So they built the line. Finally it got so bad that they had to come to some kind of an agreement, and an agreement was entered into between the Government and the company. While I do not know the geography of that portion of British Columbia sufficiently well to discuss it as the minister can, I think the great majority of these lines are in the minister's own constituency. I find here tens of thousands of dollars to be spent in the Okanagan country which I understand is in the minister's constituency. But here is one little thing that I can tell without being very intimately acquainted with the geography of the country. In the agreement between the parties it is provided that:

> The company agrees to extend within three months the local circuit from Enderby to Mara connecting with the Enderby exchange to take care of the local business.

I find in these estimates this item:

> Okanagan telephone system—establishment of rural system between Enderby and Mara, $2,100.

That must be the same thing. This carries out exactly the same idea as that laid down by the hon. Minister of Inland Revenue in Dorchester awhile ago in the House when he said: "The people want it." That is what is going on in British Columbia to-day. They made a trade with the Okanagan Telephone Company by which the telephone company is to do certain things; but sufficient political influence is brought to bear and the Government is doing it instead of the company.

Mr. REID: When was that agreement entered into?

Mr. CARVELL: The 16th June, 1917.

Mr. REID: These supplementary estimates were prepared some time ago and if that agreement was made since, of course, this item would not go on.

Mr. CARVELL: Well, if we knew these things we would discuss them.

Mr. REID: When we come to the item we will strike it out.

Mr. CARVELL: The Minister of Agriculture has been for three or four years building up the Government telephone system in his county in competition with a private firm. Now he comes down to Parliament and asks for—and I suppose it will be forced through—a vote for $50,000 for building telephone lines. Why, he is worse than the Minister of Inland Revenue. That hon. gentleman only wanted a few miles. He is a poor innocent creature. The idea of the Minister of Agriculture entering into a conspiracy with the Minister of Inland Revenue and then beating him out to that extent—putting off the poor Minister of

Inland Revenue with a paltry $3,500 and taking $50,000 for himself. The Minister of Agriculture must be covering every mount, crag and valley in his constituency with telephones. Then they jump over to Vancouver island. I suppose that is where our hon. friends from Vancouver island come in. I do not think they will contend that these are all extensions; they seem to be a lot of new works entirely. I realize that my hon. friends are all sitting around here, and I know that they are going to put up some plausible excuse for all this expenditure; but, after all, the only possible excuse is the election, nothing else in the world. These people know that without something like this they are in pretty bad shape in British Columbia, and they are simply calling upon the people in the eastern part of Canada to put up money to help them to win the election. I would think it pretty small business if the people in eastern Canada were playing the game that our friends from the West are playing. I suppose that nothing that anybody could say would divert the minister from carrying out the wishes of his friends, but this is opening up something which is very vicious. I do not know if you would expect it. There has been a good deal of talk about the Canadian Northern deal, but this is as bad as that—it is worse, because that is a great transportation proposition, it is in existence and it must be carried on in some way. Men may honestly differ as to the manner in which we should work out the Canadian Northern problem, but here is a new policy of spending public money which should be expended by the people of the locality, as is being done in nearly every other portion of Canada. All the telegraph and telephone lines which the Government have built heretofore, except in British Columbia, have been in outlying districts where there are very few people. but I learn by this report that they go into the city of Armstrong, and they are able to string their lines on electric light poles some sixty in number. Talk about going to the outlying districts. They find that traffic is so heavy that they are compelled to have additional facilities to enable them to carry on the business. Yet they say that it is necessary in order to give the people telephone communication. I think we ought to have some explanation of this matter from the minister. I am glad to see he is going to strike out one item. He should strike out the whole of those items excepting possibly that for the Yukon. I know nothing about that. I assume that, if there is to be telephonic communication in the Yukon, it may be necessary that it should be provided by the Government. With that exception, I can see no justification for this expenditure excepting that it is necessary to get votes in the coming election.

Mr. BURRELL: I do not purpose taking up very much of the time of the committee but I do not want to allow the remarks of my hon. friend—although I think they are not meant seriously—to pass without saying a few words. He seems to think that there is something sinister and peculiar in the extension of the telephone system in British Columbia. A good many remarks have been made about the system in British Columbia, and I think that the committee, or some members of it, are under some misapprehension regarding the whole matter. My hon. friend said that I seemed determined to cover every crag, valley and mountain in British Columbia with telephones. When I tell the committee that my own constituency of Yale-Cariboo is twice as big as the whole of the Maritime Provinces, hon. members will understand that we are dealing with a condition of things that is in no way comparable with the condition to be found in any other part of Canada. This telephone system has sprung out of the desire to give communication to the old established settlements far from civilization throughout the province, and as the traffic would not justify any company in taking it up it was only natural that the Government should do it. It was not this Government that took the step first.

For instance, in the north end, in 1904, when I first went over my present constituency, I took a team of horses at Ashcroft, leaving the main line of the Canadian Pacific and drove 755 miles before I saw the railway again. There were settlements like Barkerville into which gold miners went from California in 1862. These men are hundreds of miles away from other settlements, shut off from every one else. There were men there in 1904 who had never even seen a railway, some of the old miners who had gone in there in 1862. I think it is perfectly desirable and justifiable that such pioneers, who have settled the remote parts, should have, even at the expense of some of the more fortunate parts of the country, some of the advantages of modern civilization, particularly in the way of communication. There are cases like Barkerville. In

1904 I drove out from the 150 Mile House into the Chilcoten country. There are thousands of cattle there on isolated cattle ranches. I met one man over on the Fraser river who had had to send for the doctor at 150 Mile House owing to the illness of his child, an illness which did not prove to be very serious, and the doctor's visit cost $75. The man was not in touch with civilization by telegraph, railway or telephone, and it is natural how people in such districts cry out for some of the conveniences that people in better settled districts enjoy. That was the genesis of the thing, and, so far as the lower part of the country is concerned, the line was taken down there by the late Government—not by this Government—from Kamloops down through the Similkameen and Penticton country, and part of the Okanagan. This is another stretch, 250 miles and 350 to 400 miles around. When I was first there in 1904 I practically had to drive the whole distance. There was nothing there but the main line of the Canadian Pacific. It is true that, later on, the company to which my hon. friend refers came in there and established a line. They were offered a right of way on the Government line from Penticton, I think, to Vernon. They did not want that and they built a line of their own, parallelling the Government line. The Government line there had to be metallic as it was carrying the whole circuit around to the Similkameen and Okanagan country. The country went on developing, and exchanges and connections were established. I want my hon. friend to feel that I am not here to put up any plausible excuses. I am not making excuses. I have not asked for all these lines. Some of them I did not know were in, because the country is so big, and the applications were made direct to the department; and I have always taken the ground that all these things should be dealt with absolutely on their merits, and that the department should deal only with those things which were justified as of public benefit. It was quite natural that, when these large circuits were completed, the settlements, some of considerable size, should desire to be linked up to the main trunk line of the Dominion Government, and so exchanges were established and every once in a while an extension was made. I think it was justifiable for the Government to do that, and thus to make the system pay instead of being a strain as the main line was. I think that several of these districts where these votes are being asked for are now on a paying basis, and it is not a waste of money, but is a great public benefit, for the Government to build and operate the lines. It is true that when the company to which my hon. friend refers objected to some operations of the Government there was a very violent outcry, simply because the country did not want to be delivered into the hands of a company if the Government stepped out, knowing that in that event the rate might be very considerably increased, and we charge a rate that actually pays in a great many cases. But naturally, in a country like that which is very expensive to build in, they did not want to be delivered into the hands of a monopoly, and there was more or less friction between the Government and the company system. But I have done my best. I have met the directors and discussed the thing with officers and shareholders out there and have done everything I could to arrive at a settlement fair not only to the investors in the private company but to the public who are getting the advantage of Government 'phones. I think I am within the mark in saying that quite recently an agreement was entered into that is satisfactory to the company, the public, and the Government. One could not do more and one could not do less.

I do not want to discuss these items unduly, but I may take up one or two. My hon. friend referred to Bella Coola. The hon. member for Comox-Atlin (Mr. Clements) is interested in that and I am interested to this extent, that that area from Ashcroft north to Caribou, 260 miles up, was settled forty to fifty years ago and is absolutely cut off from the coast. The line running from the Caribou road, 300 miles direct to the coast of British Columbia, has put the people on all these scattered branches, all the pioneers in that country, in direct touch with the coast of British Columbia; and although it is true that these lines are costly, I think that, on the whole, this is justifiable expenditure on the part of any Government, justifiable in its inception—for it was not started by this Government—justified by its continuation by this Government on behalf of people who, whatever else may be said of them, have laboured and founded settlements in the country where they are isolated, valley from valley, by stretches of mountain ranges, and so are cut off from the privileges we enjoy. I do not think that any member would hesitate to endorse in the main the principle involved, and most of the details, if he

had lived under the conditions under which these people have lived.

Mr. CARVELL: That all sounds very nice from the standpoint of a member who wants public money expended in his constituency, and I have no doubt that everything the hon. minister has said is true. We know that if people go out into the mountains a hundred miles from Ashcroft on the Cariboo road they must not expect much civilization. But they have been going there for fifty or sixty years and people have got along very well. Perhaps they have suffered in many cases from want of telephone communication, and there is no doubt that the telephone will be as great a benefit to these people as has been pictured by the minister. But you do not have to picture things like that. I am surprised that my friend took up so much time telling us the benefits of telephone communication with the outside world. We all know as much about that as he does, although we may not know as much about the internal conditions of British Columbia. But any one who has ever been there knows that the Lord never intended very many people to live there anyway, and he will not be disappointed in the next one hundred years.

10 p.m.

Mr. BURRELL: While my hon. friend says that the Lord never intended many people to live there, down in the Okanagan valley, for which many of these votes are asked, they have sent—and that is only a very small part of my constituency—nearly 3,000 men to the front to fight our battles.

Mr. CARVELL: Yes, and they have sent them from all over Canada, too. It is no use of my friend trying to wave any flapdoodle flags. We are talking business to-night, and if my friend wants to get on his hind legs and talk that kind of thing we will do it with him. But let us talk business now, and my friend can talk to-morrow on the other side of the case. He talks about sending 3,000 men from the Okanagan valley. Does he think that he is justified, under present conditions, in spending $300,000 since the war began, in order to give telephone communication to his constituents? That is the question which I want him to answer. That is the ground on which I objected last night to the expenditure of a quarter of a million dollars in the constituency of the member for St. John (Mr. Pugsley); that is the ground on which we are finding fault with this whole transaction. My hon. friend talks about sending men to the war; yet he is willing to use $300,000 that ought to be devoted to taking care of these men and furnishing them with supplies and munitions. He does not seem to care two straws whether they get that money or not.

Mr. BURRELL: Where does my hon. friend get the $300,000?

Mr. CARVELL: Since the war began, taking into consideration this vote, the amount will be nearer $350,000 than $300,000—that is for telephones alone in British Columbia. My hon. friend talks about sending men to the war; he had better try to get money to keep those men supplied with munitions. I was charged last evening with doing a mean thing when I tried to direct the attention of the Acting Minister of Public Works to the actual condition of financial affairs in Canada to-day. I doubt whether the members of this House really know how serious the financial conditions are. I know enough to make me feel that every man in Canada who has any desire to see Canada do its duty in this war must be very seriously concerned about our financial condition. If these were normal times and the Government were anxious to embark on the principle of public ownership of telephones, I know of no place in Canada where such services are more greatly needed than in British Columbia. But it is wrong to spend $300,000 to give my hon. friend's constituents telephone communication at a time when the money is needed so badly that I dare not say here how badly it really is needed. My hon. friend knows the conditions better than I do. These works may be called extensions, but after all they are new expenditures. The Government has taken over the Okanagan Telephone Company. The people in that country have got along all right for some years with the Okanagan Telephone Company and its connections; yet fifteen or twenty extensions are proposed from the Okanagan telephone line out into different parts of the country. It might be wise to engage in this work in times of peace, but it is not all right in time of war, when undertaken by the Minister of Agriculture in order to get votes. At a time when the Empire is simply up against it in respect of the necessities of the war, the Minister of Agriculture presses the Minister of Public Works, against his will, to put a proposal like this through the House. I do not think we had

better hear any more from the minister about the men that have gone to the front from his constituency.

Mr. BURRELL: I was not forced to apply for these votes. Many of them were not known to me; they were applied for by people interested who thought they were justified. My hon. friend showed unnecessary heat in regard to one of my remarks when he said that it was no wonder that few people settled in that part of British Columbia. I merely mentioned the number of enlistments as an indication of the number of the people there were in that particular valley.

Mr. CARVELL: My hon. friend says that he did not ask for the vote. I find by this correspondence——

Mr. BURRELL: I did not say that I did not ask for any of it; I said that some of it was even unknown to me.

Mr. CARVELL: The minister had the benefit of the advice of a gentleman who was very close to the gentleman who is sitting beside him (Mr. Stevens), and who, I think, probably would know about the matter. The minister cannot take much credit to himself because he did not know of some of these items. I have no doubt that he knew about all of those affecting his own constituency.

Mr. NESBITT: I have no doubt that the Minister of Agriculture is right in his desire that these people should have telephone and telegraphic communication with the outside world. I appreciate their necessity; I myself, if I lived in a place where I had no communication with the outside world, would be glad to be furnished with telephone communication. However, these people have been there since a little after 1849, at the time of the California gold craze; they have done without telephone and telegraph communication for a great number of years, and I suppose they got along very well. That was a very touching story that we heard about the man with the sick child; I always feel sympathy for people who are so situated. At the same time, when these people went into the country of their own free will, there was no telephone ahead of them, no telegraph, no railway, in some cases no roads. Last year we bought a railway because those who had lived in the locality in question for a hundred and fifty years had never had railway communication. These people are in somewhat the same box. During three years Canada has experienced conditions of financial distress; the people are being taxed very heavily for the carrying on of the war. They do not resent that, but they do resent the undertaking of new expenditure not connected with the war. I do not say that these expenditures are being undertaken for election purposes; I do not know that that is true. But I do say that these people could get along very well without this accommodation until after the war is over. A few linkings up might have been provided for, but I think it is a short-sighted and uncalled for policy on the part of the Government to spend about $200,000 at a time when we require every dollar we can get for our part in the war. When the main estimates were going through the then Minister of Public Works (Mr. Rogers) told us that no new undertakings would be proceeded with this year, or during the war. We took his word for that, and passed his estimates as they came up. He was good enough to strike off many of the estimates that had been in for two or three years, in order to demonstrate his intention of really not undertaking any expenditure that could be avoided. As it is the intention of the Government to put these items through, no matter what we say about them, I suppose it is a waste of time to discuss them. However, I cannot but protest against this unnecessary expenditure during the war.

Mr. REID: These items are all in the estimates, and I would like them to pass. As the Minister of Agriculture has stated, we will let the department look over the whole matter again, and if there are any items that we can stand over I will promise the hon. member that, unless the works are urgently required, we shall not go ahead with them.

Mr. STEVENS: It is too late in the season to go ahead with some of them.

Mr. REID: As it is late in the season, we may not be able to go ahead with some of them. I will promise to keep the expenditure down to the very lowest possible point and to have the whole matter looked into again.

Mr. CARVELL: That is a fair proposition, although I observe by the returns of last year that work was carried on during November and December. There is a return by Mr. Stevens, the superintendent, that one man was in charge from the 3rd of October to the 12th of November, at which date another man took charge, and there is nothing to show how long he

worked, so the fact that it is late in the season would not make any difference. I pointed out the night before last how they can do these things when it is necessary and when there is an election coming on. Last February, in New Brunswick, they built roads when there was four feet of snow on the ground, and the people of that province do not know anything as compared with the people of British Columbia in regard to matters of that kind. With this pledge from the minister, while I do not withdraw my opposition, I do not feel it is necessary for me to say anything further on this subject.

Mr. McKENZIE: I must again bring to the notice of the department my serious ground for complaint about expenditures of this kind. I have repeated over and over again that my people will expect me to bring this matter to the attention of the minister. The people of my province have had large votes and large works promised to them. They have harbours requiring improvements, and fishermen of my province are in need of breakwaters and wharves. The gentleman who was for some years responsible Minister of Public Works, (Mr. Rogers) told us that the situation was grave; that money was required for other purposes, and that we must not press for money at all. As I have shown from Hansard to-night, we accepted his word in regard to the matter, and we stopped pressing for these appropriations. We were told that all the money the country could get together was for one purpose only; that any other expenditures would be of the slightest possible kind and only in regard to matters of the greatest possible urgency. The Minister of Agriculture has been in this Parliament as minister since 1911. In 1911, 1912, 1913 and the early part of 1914, there was an overflowing treasury. He found the treasury with $40,000,000 of a surplus in it, with all bills paid and the country carrying splendid sail, and everything all right. But during those years from 1911, to 1916 there was nothing in the estimates about those telephones and telegraph lines in British Columbia. Conditions have not changed in regard to them since my hon. friend became Minister of Agriculture. The necessity was just as strong years ago as it is now, and I cannot understand why a minister of the Crown should come to us at this stage, a few weeks before an election, with an extraordinary presentment of this kind. I think I have been in this House longer than the Minister of Agriculture, and in my experience of fourteen years I have never seen a private member or a minister taking the responsibility of presenting for the consideration of a committee of this House such an array of items as he presents to us in the midst of a war and a few weeks before an election. He had five or six years of better conditions when those things might have been presented, but not a word was said about them The minister may be acting in absolutely good faith, but, in view of the conditions confronting us, it looks as if this were done for a purpose, particularly in view of the statement by the ex-Minister of Public Works that no extraordinary expenditure of this kind would be made. All the ministers, who are supposed to be strong men in their counties, who are supposed not to require to be bolstered and propped up by expenditures of this kind to ensure their return to Parliament, should set a good example of economy, and should run their elections upon their strength as men and as ministers and not float their elections on votes of this kind. If a private member should present to the minister a list of items for expenditures on behalf of his constituency, what answer could he make? No answer at all.

Mr. PUGSLEY: I wish to correct a statement which the Minister of Agriculture has made and which, I think, is an error. I do not say that he intentionally sought to mislead the committee, because I do not think the minister would intentionally mislead any one.

Mr. BURRELL: Certainly not.

Mr. PUGSLEY: The Minister of Agriculture rather put forward the argument that these extraordinary votes were required because the people to be accommodated were in remote settlements in British Columbia shut out from the world, and that, therefore, it was only reasonable and fair that they should have telephonic communication. But the larger amounts are for telephonic communication in well-settled districts of British Columbia. Take for instance the Golden-Windermere line, the extension from Windermere to Fairmont. There is a daily train running all the way from Golden to the Crow's Nest line, as my hon. friend knows. The country is well settled and there are quite a number of prosperous villages, almost towns, in that locality. It is one of the most beautiful sections of country to be found in the world, and a private telephone

system would be almost as apt to pay there as in any other part of Canada. Then again take the Okanagan valley. There are some eight or ten telephone lines there connected with the Okanagan Valley Telephone system. There is a railway from Sicamous Junction to the head of the lake, and there is daily steamer communication, summer and winter, from the head of the lake to the foot. The country is beautiful, rich and well-settled. That surely does not come within the description that the minister has sought to give to the committee of the localities occupied by those people to whom telephone accommodation is being given. Let us take the largest amount in the estimates, $28,000 for an extension from Ashcroft to Agassiz in connection with the Okanagan Valley Telephone system. Both of those points are stations on the Canadian Pacific. Thus the proposal is to spend $28,000 to build a telephone line between two important stations on that line of railway.

Mr. CARVELL: They have the Canadian Northern on the other side of it.

Mr. PUGSLEY: It cannot be said that the people in that district are shut out from the world. They have the two termini, and the stations on the Canadian Pacific.

Mr. STEVENS: My hon. friend shows he is unacquainted with the facts. The item he has mentioned, $28,000, was put in the estimates, I believe, on the strongest possible recommendation of the Board of Trade of Vancouver.

Mr. REID: Yes.

Mr. STEVENS: For this reason: hitherto the only telephonic communication between the large mining centres of the interior of British Columbia and the coast, the financial centres, has been Seattle, Spokane, and north from Nelson and further in. It has been an exceedingly difficult method of communication. By linking the line from Agassiz to Ashcroft, we can have a direct line through from the coast to the interior. One of the great trials in British Columbia during the 25 years that I have been a resident of the province has been to see millions and millions of dollars worth of business going to Spokane every year from the interior of British Columbia. Two things are going to overcome that. One is already in operation, the Kettle Valley railroad. That is one of the most necessary works to link up the coast district with the interior. This telephone system is another vastly important one. My hon. friend from Carleton (Mr. Carvell) mentioned another thing, and that is the necessity for retrenching, because of economic conditions. I do not want to make any far-fetched argument. I am discussing this matter from a business and economic standpoint. We have been developing in British Columbia certain mining centres. We have Princeton and we have Hedley, and we have mining districts on the Kootenay further east again. These have all been linked up by the Government system, and they would never have been linked up by any other system. A great many of these items, while headed Okanagan, have very little to do with the settlement of Okanagan. They connect the main Okanagan trunk line with outlying districts and with centres remote from civilization. The mining centres are usually away off in the mountains, remote from settled districts. I will give one illustration, to give the committee an idea of what we are up against. One company has spent about $3,000,000 in the last two years in diamond drill work at Copper mountain. They have actually proven that there is over 11,000,000 tons of copper ore in the mountain, and they are tunnelling to take it out. That is only one company, and there are dozens. One of the greatest industries is mining, and the only way you can successfully produce from our mining resources is by having adequate communication and proper methods. Those are essential.

Mr. PUGSLEY: How far is that mine from the main Government line?

Mr. STEVENS: I should say it would be about ten miles.

Mr. PUGSLEY: And that company has spent $3,000,000 in drill work, and want the Government to provide them with a telephone? In New Brunswick the lumbermen would have provided themselves with a telephone, if they spent a fraction of that sum.

Mr. STEVENS: I say that is just an illustration of what one company is doing, and we have dozens in the interior in a similar position. As far as telephonic communication is concerned, nearly all that mining business has been done through Spokane. My hon. friend will see on the file letters from the Vancouver Board of Trade, which have been working on this proposition for years, to try and induce the Government to put this line through. The telephone company out there, which operates on the coast, goes to Agassiz; it would not build the line from Agassiz to Ashcroft and into the interior. No com-

pany would do that. There is a stretch of country there which, if we can connect it up, will bring the whole business of the interior of British Columbia into Vancouver, and it is of vital importance, not only to Vancouver but to Canada as a whole, to keep the business as far as possible within Canadian channels. When I went to British Columbia we used to think the dry belt south of Kamloops was utterly useless except for grazing. I do not think that at that time there was a bushel of wheat exported from that district. Last year 250,000 bushels was exported from Kamloops, raised in the district to the south, to which it is desired to extend this telephone line. I received a letter yesterday from a man who had gone in there, taken up land and gone into farming, and he said the only way to induce people to go into these districts was to give them some sort of communication. Then there is the Okanagan valley, which exported to different parts of Canada, over 3,000 carloads of fruit and vegetables. The hon. gentleman must remember that if you are going to develop production in British Columbia, or anywhere else, you have to provide facilities. Unfortunately in British Columbia our agricultural land is in the valleys, and is split up by long ranges of mountains, more or less remote, and can only be reached by certain avenues of communication. These votes are for the purpose of linking up the scattered districts in British Columbia. I know my hon. friend is not serious when he casts a reflection on British Columbia as a desirable place in which to live, as I know when he was there two years ago he expressed considerable pleasure over his visit. We will not censure him in that regard, because I am sure he does not wish to reflect upon the province. Those who have lived there for many years think a great deal of British Columbia as a place to live in.

Mr. CARVELL: The old saying, "Every man to his liking, as the old woman said when she kissed the cow," but if it suits my hon. friend I have no objection. However, the hon. gentleman has made the strongest argument against the granting of this money that could possibly be made. He is speaking of a country where the mining companies are spending $3,000,000 in development, and taking out $10,000,000 worth of ore. They have a valley which exports 3,000 carloads of fruit. The country around Kamloops which was always supposed to be a dry country, last year exported a million bushels of wheat. In our country, when we have conditions of that kind, we build our own telephone lines, we do not ask the Government to build them. No argument so absolutely condemns the proposition as that of my hon. friend from Vancouver.

Mr. STEVENS: My point is that there is a piece of country going through the Hope Mountain from Agassiz to Ashcroft, where there is no settlement, hardly, except on the line of the Canadian Pacific, running, as my hon. friend will probably remember, a distance of 85 miles or thereabouts. No company will build a line there, and our only communication between Kamloops and those districts which I have mentioned and Vancouver, is by a route about 650 or 700 miles, by way of Spokane and Seattle. It is absolutely absurd to say that the huge developments in the interior of British Columbia are to be deprived of means of communication with the business centre and shipping facilities of Vancouver, for the want of a few miles of trunk telephone lines.

Mr. CARVELL: That is exactly what I thought. There is enormous business in the centres and there is enormous business in Vancouver, but they will not spend their own money in order to get telephone communication.

Mr. STEVENS: How could the city of Vancouver or the district around Vancouver spend money to have telephone communication?

Mr. CARVELL: They are spending money all over Canada. Capitalists are putting up the money. The moment there is business to be done they can get a telephone line, but as long as they have a paternal government, with the Minister of Agriculture saying, "Never mind whether you are getting money to pay for munitions or not, we will stand by you for the telephones," of course they will not put up their own money for telephones. Just as long as the minister holds out the hope that the Government will furnish the money, just so long will the capitalists sit back and let the Government do it. I am opposing this whole system of public ownership of telephones. The Government in its paternalism is building those lines, and if it left them alone they would be built by business men.

Mr. PUGSLEY: Reference was made to the extension of lines from Ashcroft to Agassiz. I understand there is telegraph communication between those points.

Mr. STEVENS: Yes.

Mr. REID: If the items are passed, the Minister of Agriculture and I will go through the whole list, and if we can see our way clear not to proceed with any of them, we will do so.

Mr. CARVELL: You can do without them all.

Mr. REID: We will do without as many as we can.

Mr. CARVELL: My hon. friend knows very well that the Railway Commission would give them authority to put a circuit upon the poles of the Canadian Pacific or the Canadian Northern between Ashcroft and Agassiz, if necessary.

Mr. STEVENS: Perhaps they are going to do that.

Mr. CARVELL: There are many cases where the telephone wires are strung along the railway poles. If the business people of British Columbia wanted those lines, and were not looking to the Government for them, there would be no difficulty at all in getting the connection.

Okanagan telephone system—establishment of rural system between Enderby and Mara, $2,100.

Mr. REID: I move that this item be struck out.

Motion agreed to, and item struck out.

Public works—chargeable to income—miscellaneous—river gaugings and metering—further amount required, $7,500.

Mr. REID: This further amount of $7,500 is asked for by District Engineer Chapleau for maintenance of gauges above lake of the Woods, automatic and sight, calibration of power section Fort Frances-International Falls, office reduction of data and compilation. This work is necessary in order to collect data as to the fluctuation of various rivers so that information regarding all rivers will eventually be on record. The work done during the present fiscal year consisted of maintenance of gauges, securing and calibration of data, and general supervision of private works on the river.

Gratuity to Onesime Chayer, who was permanently injured while at work at Lake Timiskaming dam—further amount, $500.

Mr. PUGSLEY: How much was paid to him before?

Mr. REID: Five hundred dollars.

To pay Robert Dunbar for reporting proceedings at coroner's inquest into the death of the victims of the Parliament buildings fire, $74.40.

[Mr. Stevens.]

Mr. PUGSLEY: Would the minister kindly state whether it is intended to pay any claims which have been presented for loss of property in the fire?

Mr. REID: There was a statement made the other day to the effect that certain claims were filed, but they have not yet been considered. Of course they have nothing to do with this item.

Mr. PUGSLEY: This item is for reporting proceedings.

Mr. REID: It is to pay Mr. Dunbar for reporting proceedings at the coroner's inquest into the death of the victims.

Mr. SINCLAIR: Will the minister tell us how these property claims came to be filed?

Mr. REID: The parties simply filed them.

Mr. SINCLAIR: Was there any indication given by the department that it would consider claims?

Mr. REID: No, they just sent them in.

Construction and operation of water storage dams on Ottawa river and tributaries, surveys in connection therewith and settlement of land damages—further amount required, $20,000.

Mr. PUGSLEY: I feel somewhat interested in this work, because it was initiated while I had the honour of occupying the position of Minister of Public Works. I would like to ask whether the results have been satisfactory.

Mr. REID: It is working out satisfactorily.

Compassionate allowances to the widows of the late members of the crew of dredge No. 6, who were drowned when the vessel was wrecked in a storm near Shag Rock, N.S., on the 17th January, 1917, as follows: $2,000 each to the widows of Capt. L. A. Hatfield, Alzear LeBlanc, Harry Burrows, Peter Bonin, William Holland, John Greek, Gordon Miller; $1,000 each to the widow and mother of A. R. Selig, and $1,000 to the mother of Foster Knickle—$17,000.

Mr. SINCLAIR: Will the minister explain the difference in the allowance given to the relatives of the members of the crew?

Mr. REID: My information is that in the case of the married men $2,000 goes to the widows and families of the men who were drowned, and in the case of single men, $1,000 goes to the relatives.

Mr. NESBITT: The item says: "$1,000 each to the widow and mother of A. R. Selig, and $1,000 to the mother of Foster Knickle"

Mr. REID: In the case of Selig, $1,000 went to the widow and $1,000 to the mother.

Mr. SINCLAIR: The point is, one widow gets $2,000 and another only $1,000. This has occurred at different times during the present session.

Mr. REID: In the case of A. R. Selig, his mother and his widow get $1,000 each. They were both living with him. Foster Knickle was unmarried and his mother was living with him. She gets $1,000. The intention was to give $1,000 to each of the persons who were living with and dependent on the person drowned.

Mr. SINCLAIR: We have just passed an item for the widow of the late C. Gee who was drowned on June 14, 1917, near Nanaimo. In that case we have given $2,000. I cannot understand why one widow gets $1,000 and another $2,000.

Mr. REID: In one case the man left a widow and a mother who were the only ones who were dependent on him. In the other case there was a widow with children. She had a small family dependent on her.

Mr. SINCLAIR: The dredge was wrecked on the coast of my constituency. It was sent in the winter along the south coast of Nova Scotia at a very stormy season without any proper appliances to enable the men to escape. The hawser broke, the dredge went on the rocks, there was no lifeboat and no way of the men escaping. Their lives were apparently thrown away by the carlessness of some of the officials of the department. Has the minister a report of the accident from which he can give us some information? I do not think we have had any information beyond that which has appeared in the newspapers.

Mr. REID: There was an official examination by the wreck commissioner and the report is in the department. I have not got it here now. I am told that the wreck commissioner exonerates the officials of the Public Works Department entirely.

Mr. SINCLAIR: Who was to blame?

Mr. REID: It was the storm. It was an extraordinary storm.

Mr. SINCLAIR: Why was the dredge sent there in the winter time?

Mr. REID: She had gone before over the same course exactly in the winter time and no trouble had resulted. But in this case a great storm came on. The wreck commissioner, if any blame could be attached to anybody, would have had no hesitation in placing the blame.

Mr. SINCLAIR: My recollection is that a tug was taking this dredge along the coast and that the men on the dredge were those who were drowned. They had no life-boats and no means of escape. Because of a defective hawser, the dredge parted from the tug and was swept on the rocks. I do not know how everybody can be exonerated from blame for an occurrence like that. I have never seen any satisfactory explanation as to why that dredge was moved from one part of Nova Scotia to the other at that season of the year. There was no work for it at the place where it was going, and it was not sent there, I understand to do any particular work at that time. There is a suspicion among the people who have suffered from this accident that somebody was to blame.

Mr. REID: If there had been any possible chance of blame being attached to anybody, the wreck commissioner would have found some one to blame. But he exonerates the officials in every way. In the report I find it is stated that:

> The court found that the loss of the dredge and scows was due primarily to the scow breaking adrift from the dredge; secondly, the Roebling's hawser parting; and lastly, to the inability of the crew of the dredge to get the Roebling's hawser on board the scow. The loss of the crew is attributed to the fact that they did not get in their boats when they were first put in the water, and why they did not do so, the court failed to understand.
>
> No blame was in any way attached to the department in connection with the loss of the dredge.

Mr. SINCLAIR: That does not explain why the dredge went there in the stormy season.

Mr. REID: We would not have much to do with the details. They are all attended to by the officials of that department. But this report says that no blame should be attached to them. I take it for granted that she was being sent at the end of the season.

Mr. SINCLAIR: What is the date of the wreck?

Mr. REID: The report states:

> They left Isaac's Harbour at 7.30 a.m., January 17, and at 9.30 a.m. the stern scow broke adrift. The wind was then W.S.W. and increasing, and sea rising. The Lisgar after having been signalled several times by the dredge, let go his hawser from the dredge and picked the scow up. At 11.45 a.m. the Roebling's hawser parted close to the dredge. After heaving the hawser in, they bent on a 3½-inch line, steamed down close to the dredge and after some time succeeded in getting the small line on board the dredge and told them on the dredge to haul in and get a turn with

the hawser—they did not do this but made the small line fast. Capt. Mood of the Roebling then told them that he would try and turn the dredge round so as to give them a lee side to put their boats out on—he had just succeeded in getting the dredge round when the small line parted.

In the meantime the captain of the Lisgar when he saw that the dredge had broken adrift attempted to heave his line in, which he could not do and then gave orders to cut the line. When this was done he proceeded close to the dredge in order to render any assistance possible.

The dredge put both her boats in the water, while the tugs lay to leeward in order to pick them up—the boats of the dredge lay alongside for some time but no attempt was made by any of the crew to get in them. Finally, one boat capsized and the other one shortly after broke adrift.

A dory was then launched over the Roebling's stern and drifted alongside the dredge. The dredge in the meantime had let go both anchors and swung head to the wind. No attempt was made by any of the crew on the dredge to get into the dory, which capsized and broke adrift about ten minutes afterwards.

The Lisgar then proceeded into the Life Saving Station at Deeming Point, but found the life-boat broken up. She then proceeded out towards the dredge.

The dredge struck on Black Ledge, pounded over and sank at 2.30 p.m., in the vicinity of Shag Rock.

Perhaps the hon. member knows these waters generally. I suppose that the dredges work pretty late in the season?

Mr. SINCLAIR: This was the worst time of the year probably.

Mr. REID: At all events, that is the report we have.

Mr. SINCLAIR: It contains no explanation of why the dredge was moved at that time. There is certainly an apparent carelessness on the part of the Marine Department in regard to the life saving station located at that port.

From the statement of the minister it would appear that the lifeboat at that place was broken and was unable to give any assistance to the wreck. If the lifeboat had been in proper repair the lifecrew might have saved the lives of those men. That has been stated in the press on several occasions, and I have never seen any proper explanation of the lifeboat's condition. The late inspector said in a letter which I saw that the Marine Department was notified that the lifeboat was broken and a request was made for a new one, but that request was disregarded by the department. Then the accident came and those men lost their lives. It is discreditable to the department if that is the case. I should like some explanation of the dredge being taken from Yarmouth, or from Lunenburg to Cape Breton at that season of the year.

Mr. REID: The dredge was being taken to Sydney to undergo repairs and receive a new boiler for the next season's work.

Mr. SINCLAIR: But there is no slip or dry-dock at Sydney.

Mr. REID: She would not have to go into dry-dock to have a new boiler put in. The department have had dredges repaired at Sydney.

Mr. SINCLAIR: Why did the dredge pass Halifax?

Mr. REID: I do not know. It was going to Sydney. As to the question about the lifeboat, the report says that there were boats enough on the dredge but that the men did not enter them.

Mr. SINCLAIR: The boats were too small to live in that sea.

Mr. REID: The report does not say that. Of course the question of the lifeboat comes under the Marine Department.

Mr. McKENZIE: Does not the report say something about negligence in not dismantling the dredge?

Mr. REID: I do not see anything of that in the report.

Mr. SINCLAIR: The minister will understand that I am not in any way opposing the vote. My reason for insisting on some information is that the relatives of the men who were lost have felt, I understand, that some person was to blame and that there was carelessness on the part of both the Marine and Fisheries and Public Works Departments in this matter.

Mr. McKENZIE: It is another case where the advice of this distinguished man whom the minister seems to follow in all these things proved disastrous to the lives of these men. This vessel was being dragged to Sydney for the purpose of getting work for J. C. Douglas' friends in the city of Sydney—some miserable patronage. It was being taken there in the midst of winter along the most dangerous coast of Canada, without being dismantled and without any precautions being taken, in order that a few dollars could be spent in Mr. Douglas' constituency. The result is that those men have lost their lives and the Government has lost its property. It would be well for the minister not to be so very zealous in carrying out Mr. Douglas' representations.

11 p.m.

and to be a little more careful about putting lives in jeopardy in mid-winter in order to please Mr. Douglas and to make a few miserable votes from the graft that might be made out of this vessel. There was no other reason for their going there at that time of the year.

Public works—chargeable to collection of revenue—Levis graving dock—further amount required, $2,500.

Mr. LEMIEUX: How is the work on the graving dock at Lévis progressing?

Mr. REID: The new dock will be completed and in operation this year.

Telegraph and telephone lines—Prince Edward Island and mainland—revote of lapsed amount, $14,000.

Mr. SINCLAIR: Will the minister explain this item?

Mr. REID: That is for two annual subsidies of $7,000 each due to the Anglo-American Company for 1915 and 1916.

Mr. SINCLAIR: Does a company own the line and the Government pay a yearly subsidy?

Mr. REID: Yes. Since Confederation this has been done. It was part of the terms of Confederation.

Mr. LEMIEUX: You control the rates?

Mr. REID: Yes.

Mr. SINCLAIR: Why are we voting two year's subsidy now?

Mr. REID: There was a dispute between the department and this company as to the rates that they should charge and as to other matters connected with the operation of the line. For this reason, during about two years the subsidy was not paid, pending final settlement of the dispute.

Mr. SINCLAIR: We get no revenue from it.

Mr. REID: No. This communication is furnished under the terms of Confederation.

Mr. LEMIEUX: Navigation is closed for several months of the year between Pictou and the Madgalen islands. Under an arrangement made at my request, during the winter months the people of the Magdalen islands received over the cable a synopsis of news from the outside world, which was distributed to different places on the island over the telegraph line. Is that service being continued?

Mr. REID: For all I know, it is. I do not know that there has been any change.

Mr. McKENZIE: The cable between the Magdalen Islands and the mainland lands at a place called Meat cove. For about a year the cable was broken, and it was not repaired,—there was a good deal of complaint about the negligence of those in charge. On that account, for a time the winter news of which the hon. member (Mr. Lemieux) speaks was not conveyed from the mainland to the Magdalen islands. But the real reason was that the highly competent operator who had been in charge of the cable station at Bay St. Lawrence was dismissed by this Government. In her place they put two men, neither of whom was a telegrapher. One was named McNeil and the other McDonald; they are still there. No, and then they pick up a boy here, and a boy there and get them to do some operating. It was found convenient—by those who wanted to help them out—to keep this cable broken. There was a combination between the men who were in charge as operators and the men who were in charge of fixing the cable, and that convenient arrangement was carried out. The cable was not in a position to receive any news; it was so arranged that the blame would not fall upon those men. That is the condition there. The hon. member for Rouville (Mr. Lemieux) will find that if the people on the Mgdalen islands expect to get a news service from the mainland, they will have to insist upon the Government putting a competent operator in charge of the operating station. The Government is paying big salaries to men who are absolutely incapable of doing the work.

Mr. CARVELL: Surely the minister is not going to allow a charge like that to go by unnoticed? This is the worst of all the charges that has been made during the course of these estimates. What has the minister to say about it?

Mr. REID: All I have to say is this: It is hard for me to believe that any person in charge of a telegraph office would deliberately break the cable, as the hon. member has stated.

Mr. McKENZIE: I did not say that they had broken the cable. The line was left broken for over a year.

Mr. REID: Then I misunderstood the hon. gentleman.

Mr. McKENZIE: Hansard will show that I said nothing of the kind. The line broke at a convenient time, and for over a year

it was left in that condition without being repaired.

Mr. REID: Well, we will put it that way—

Mr. McKENZIE: There is no need of putting it that way; that is what I said. I did not say that they broke the wire.

Mr. REID: Do I understand the hon. member to say that this line was conveniently broken, and that it was kept in that condition for a year?

Mr. McKENZIE: I did not say that it was broken by somebody. I said that it broke at a convenient season; that it was left in that condition all through the winter; that for over a year it was not repaired, notwithstanding the fact that the cable vessel Tyrian was in the vicinity.

Mr. REID: It is hard for me to believe that any man would be capable of doing such a thing. However, the hon. gentleman has made these statements—

Mr. McKENZIE: I have made them, and I stand by them.

Mr. REID: I am not asking the hon. member to take them back. As I have said, it is difficult for me to believe that any man would do such a thing, but as the hon. member has made the statement, I would not feel justified in letting the matter rest at that. Whether I had answered the hon. gentleman's remarks or not, I would have asked the deputy minister to make inquiries and to get some explanation of the matter. Certainly if men would do a thing of that kind, I do not hesitate to say that they are not fit for the positions that they are filling.

Mr. CARVELL: They should be prosecuted.

Mr. REID: They should be prosecuted if they did anything of that kind.

Mr. McKENZIE: The minister is absolutely wrong in saying that I said that they broke the cable. I gave the minister all the data that he requires; I know what I am talking about. Let him inquire when Mr. Theriault and his wife were dismissed. They were capable officials; they were dismissed for party reasons, without the slightest justification. Let him find out, also, when the cable broke; that must be a matter of record in the department. He will find that the cable broke very shortly after the change. I do not say that these people broke the cable, but I do say that the cable broke very shortly after these two incompetent persons were appointed. For over a year the cable was left in that condition; that also must be on record in the department. The minister will find that during the time when this cable remained broken, he had these incompetent men in charge—men who could neither receive nor transmit a message. That is sufficient data for an inquiry. Let the minister investigate the matter; he will find that I am absolutely correct.

Mr. REID: I shall certainly inquire into it.

Mr. McKENZIE: Those men are still in charge.

Mr. REID: The cable was broken and no business could be done. What I cannot understand—

Mr. McKENZIE: The minister says that the cable was broken. I repeat that the cable broke; I do not know who broke it or how it broke. The breaking of the cable, however, synchronized with the appointment of these men.

Mr. LEMIEUX: During the fifteen years that I represented Magdalen islands as part of the county of Gaspé, it frequently happened that the cable broke, because it is exposed to the shifting of the ice in that section of the gulf of St. Lawrence. Possibly that was the cause of the breaking in this instance.

As to the facts, I do not know. I know that the people of the Magdalen islands were given, during the winter months, a synopsis of the news, and besides they had made arrangements with the Public Works Department through Mr. Keely, as they do most of their business with Halifax, Sydney, Pictou, and Nova Scotia generally, to wire their letters at a very low rate to the operator at Meat cove, and then the operator would mail their messages to the firms at Halifax, Sydney or Pictou, thus facilitating business with the Magdalen islands during the winter months. My hon. friend may not know it, but there is a very interesting and large population in the Magdalen islands. There are 6,000 people there, and there are some very large industries, for instance, the lobster and mackerel industries. There are some very large firms from Nova Scotia operating on the islands, and in the spring, summer and fall of the year, Americans do considerable fishing in that district. According to the Fisheries Treaty, that is one, if not the only spot in the Gulf of St. Lawrence where they can get their bait and enjoy all the privileges of our own fishermen, so that for several months in the

year the Magdalen islands are frequented by a large fleet of schooners and other vessels. In the winter months however, the islanders are deprived of all communication with business firms on the mainland. I, therefore, made arrangements that they could wire their letters at a low rate to the Meat cove cable office, and the operator would mail them from that point. Each time, however, the breakage occurred, the Tyrian, which is the repairing vessel in the Gulf of St. Lawrence, could at once find out the break and make repairs; but I never heard that the cable had been out of business for such a long period as this.

Mr. REID: That is a surprise to me too.

Mr. LEMIEUX: If that is the case, it is bad for the department, and I would urge the minister to see to it that this cable is put into proper order.

Mr. REID: It is a surprise to me, too, that the cable should be out of order for a year. I cannot understand it because the officials of the Department of Public Works, with whom I have come in contact during the different times that I have been acting as minister of that department, have, always, in my judgment, been very capable men and very attentive to their duties, and unless there was some reason why that vessel could not be got, I cannot understand how the break could have been left for a year. During the war the Tyrian might have been employed on some other work from which it was hard to take her away. I have no explanation to offer why that break was not repaired within a year, but I will certainly make inquiries.

Mr. PUGSLEY: It would be better to let the item stand until the minister gets the information.

Mr. REID: There is no item in connection with the Magdalen islands.

Mr. LEMIEUX: Will the minister see that the news service is re-established; that the cable is repaired, and that the same system is maintained as regards the mailing of letters from the cable office?

Mr. REID: Yes, but the deputy has no information to show that the cable has not been repaired.

Mr. McKENZIE: I think it is repaired now.

Mr. REID: The hon. member has just asked if I will see that it is repaired, but I understand that it is repaired. I understand also the news service is going on.

Mr. SINCLAIR: Who recommended the dismissal of Mrs. Theriault and the appointment of McNeil and McDonald as operators of this station?

Mr. REID: I have not that information.

Mr. SINCLAIR: I think the minister ought to give that information to the committee. It is rather a serious matter if, at an important station like that, we have incompetent men appointed by some political influence, although unable to send a message. It looks like a very foolish thing for us to vote money to maintain a cable line if the people at the station are unable to send the message. What does the minister say to that?

Mr. REID: I do not know whether I can get the information as to who recommended the dismissal and the appointments. Those recommendations, of course—

Mr. CARVELL: I guess it is Mr. Douglas all right. He does all that work down there.

Mr. REID: If that answer is satisfactory to the hon. member, of course, I am willing to let it go. I do not know whether I can get that information or not. I can ascertain whether this man is really capable to fill the position. I shall have to take the opinion of the officer in charge.

Mr. SINCLAIR: Will the minister bring down all the correspondence and papers in connection with the dismissal and appointment of these parties?

Mr. REID: I have told the deputy minister that, if there is any correspondence in the department, to bring it to me, and I will bring it down or send it to the hon. member.

Mr. McKENZIE: That matter was in charge of Mr. A. B. McDonald, who is now chief electrician of the Government on board of the Tyrian, a most capable man who was operator at that station for many years, and who, no doubt, was receiving and sending those cable letters. When he was appointed as inspector by the former Government—and Mr. Macdonald was a friend of the present Administration, having been there long before the change in 1896—he left the office and moved away with his family. Mr. Theriault, a former resident of the Magdalen islands, was appointed in his place. Mr. Theriault was not much of an operator himself, but his wife was a most capable operator. She taught her sons to send the messages, and she and her children took charge of the

office. Shortly after this Government came into power, these people were dismissed without the slightest justification, and two farmers and fishermen, who had not any more knowledge of telegraphy than I have, were appointed. How they got along, I do not know, but Providence intervened and broke the cable. With the cable broken, there was very little for them to do, and they have got along nicely up until now and are drawing handsome salaries. It was a case of the cable be darned and let the farming go to the dogs while they drew their salaries in this way. That is the situation exactly. Whether telegraphy grew into their heads without their receiving any instruction, I do not know, but there they are, and the minister can see them there any day in the week.

Telegraph and telephone lines—British Columbia mainland—further amount required, $2,200.

Mr. CARVELL: Surely British Columbia ought to have been satisfied with what they have already received this evening.

Mr. REID: This is a small amount.

Mr. CARVELL: What is it for? Eight or nine thousand is a small amount for British Columbia.

Mr. REID: This is for increases in the salaries of those who are receiving less than $1,200. This increase is made on account of the high cost of living, and the operators are getting small pay.

Mr. CARVELL: On what principle are the tolls from rentals based in the telephone system in British Columbia? Is it the same as in Nova Scotia, or have they a modern system where people can rent a telephone, as in other parts of Canada?

Mr. REID: The only information I can give the hon. gentleman is that given in the official report.

Mr. CARVELL: There is nothing in that.

Mr. REID: The information in this book is as follows:

Kamloops-Okanagan Valley System (Telephone).

Local and through rates, 25 cents to 60 cents, according to distance between offices 100 miles apart or over, in stretches of 50 miles':
Where message rate is 25c. for 10 words, 2c. for extra words: conversation 10c. per minute.
Where message rate is 25c. for 10 words, 3c. for extra words: conversation 15c. per minute.
Where message rate is 40c. for 10 words, 3c. for extra words: conversation 20c. per minute.
Where message rate is 50c. for 10 words, 4c. for extra words: conversation 25c. per minute.
Where message rate is 60c. for 10 words, 4c. for extra words: conversation 30c. per minute.
Minimum charge for messages, 25c.; for conversation, 15c.

Mr. CARVELL: That is for telegrams.

Mr. REID: No, this is the Kamloops and Okanagan telephone system.

Mr. LEMIEUX: Any charge for listening?

Mr. REID: Fifteen cents per minute in some cases. Then we have the rates for the Salt Spring Island telephone system as follows:

Local rate—Conversation, 2 minutes, 25c.; each additional minute, 15c.
Through rate—The above line connects with the B.C. Telephone Co. at Duncan Station. The company's tolls are added to the above rates on through business.
Conjoint rate—between offices on the above island and offices on the C.P. line, on government line reached by the C.P. telegraph on Vancouver Island, 25.2.

Then there is the Golden-Windermere telephone line:

Local and through rate, 25.2.
Subscribers for telephone at $36 per year are exempt from above tolls for messages.

Mr. CARVELL: If a man rents a telephone, and pays $36 a year, he has the long distance thrown in.

Mr. REID: No, he can only telephone on that exchange. Then the Vancouver Island line:

Local rates between offices, 25.2.
Conjoint rate between offices on government line and C. P. telegraph line on Vancouver Island, 25.2.
Through rate, business exchange with Canadian Pacific telegraph at Nanaimo and Victoria, same as local rate, 25.2.

Mr. CARVELL: I was asking as to whether the same system prevails in British Columbia as in Nova Scotia. It seems to me that, in Nova Scotia, only a favoured few can obtain telephone, and practically there is no rental at all, as I understand it. They pay a certain rate for a distance beyond the main line. The telephone is put in a man's place of business, and that is the sort of public place where business comes. But there is no such thing as rental as known in the telephone world. Does that condition of things obtain in British Columbia, or are there rentals?

Mr. REID: In British Columbia it is the ordinary telephone system. They rent the telephone.

Mr. CARVELL: What is the rental?

Mr. REID: In British Columbia $36 a year.

Prince Edward Island and mainland—revote of lapsed amount, $14,000.

Mr. MACDONALD: I was not in when the Prince Edward Island and mainland vote was passed. Was that for cabling or telephone? I understand there is telephone communication between Prince Edward Island and the mainland.

Mr. REID: I explained that item of $14,000 in the estimates. An agreement was made at the time of Confederation that the Government were to keep up that communication, and $7,000 a year was the arrangement made with the Anglo-American Telegraph Company. Since Confederation the Government have been paying $7,000 a year as a subsidy. This has been paid every year. This $14,000 is for 1915 and 1916. The reason it was not paid in these years, as I explained, was this: The Department of Public Works was negotiating a new agreement with the Anglo-American as to the rate of toll—and the hon. gentleman knows when you come to make an arrangement for tolls it cannot be done in a hurry. While negotiations were being carried on the Department of Public Works refused to pay the subsidy. When an agreement has been made and signed the Government has to pay the subsidy, and not having paid it in 1915 and 1916, they have to pay it now.

Mr. MACDONALD: Nothing to do with telephones?

Mr. REID: No.

Mr. McKENZIE: Will this matter come under the Railway Board?

Mr. REID: I suppose so, because all these rates are under the Railway Board of Canada.

Laprairie—repairs to wharf and completion of approach, $4,000.

Three Rivers—repairs to wharf—revote, $9,500.

Mr. REID: These two items were held over. The Laprairie-Napierville item was for repairs to wharf, but I am willing that that item should be struck out. The wharf should be kept in repair, but we will drop it.

Mr. LEMIEUX: I saw the hon. gentleman from Laprairie, who was called away, and he maintains the objection he made last night. I know the conditions because I was brought up in that district. In the old days there was a steamer service between Montreal and Laprairie, but this was abandoned ten years ago. The last boat which plied between Montreal and Laprairie was destroyed by fire seven or eight years ago, and you can see the remains of the steamer near the wharf, and the channel which was used by that steamboat from Montreal to Laprairie has been partly filled, so that even if you were to repair the wharf, which is not badly in need of repair, you would have to dig a new channel between Montreal and Laprairie for that size of boat.

Mr. REID: I am striking it out.

Mr. LEMIEUX: It is not necessary.

Mr. REID: There was the other item for Three Rivers, to which my hon. friend (Mr. Bureau) raised some objection last night. Last year we had an appropriation of $20,000 to repair this wharf, which is used on a large scale for the unloading of coal. The officials tell me it is absolutely necessary to finish up this work, and I would not feel justified in dropping the item altogether. I will have to ask the committee to allow it to stand.

Mr. LEMIEUX: Still you have the objection made by the hon. member from Three Rivers, which seems to be very radical. He said last night:

An additional amount was voted to complete the work, and it seems to be in perfect shape now. It was filled up with quicksand. That was washed out and it was refilled, branches, dirt and sand being put on the top. I do not see where the work is now required. They have been putting stone on the end of the wharf that faces the current and that meets the ice jams in the spring.

Considering the view taken by the hon. member from Three Rivers, who has a perfect knowledge of the situation, I do not see how the minister would be justified in maintaining that item.

Mr. REID: I hardly think the hon. member for Three Rivers went into the matter as thoroughly as he should have done.

Mr. LEMIEUX: Will the minister promise in this case, as he did in the case of the telephone lines, that before spending the money he will see that a proper inspection is made, and that no money will be spent unless it is absolutely required.

Mr. REID: I will certainly do so.

New Brunswick—St. John harbour—extension of and repairs from Negro Point breakwater, $250,000.

Mr. PUGSLEY: Would the minister state what the work would cost?

Mr. REID: The work if proceeded with would cost $750,000 to complete. We will

have to look into the matter thoroughly. In the meantime I would like the item to stand.

Mr. PUGSLEY: Are the figures based upon the idea of utilizing stone from Partridge island?

Mr. REID: The parties tendering were free to take the stone from wherever they wished.

Ontario—Stayner—public building, $10,000.

Mr. PUGSLEY: I believe the minister was going to consider the advisability of striking out this item. I think he should be guided by the fact that when the Minister of Finance (Sir Thomas White) was asking for the passage of the Bill relating to taxation, and indeed in bringing forward subsequent measures, he gave his assurance to the House that no new work would be undertaken. I think that pledge should be lived up to. A great many items have been struck out on that ground.

Mr. REID: I agree that that was the understanding, and therefore I am not sure that we will go on with the work.

Mr. PUGSLEY: I think it would be better if the item were struck out.

Mr. REID: Perhaps it would be as well to leave it in, and we will not proceed with it if it is new work.

Mr. PUGSLEY: It must be new work, because the amount is required to buy the land.

Mr. REID: If that be so, I suppose we will have to strike it out.

Mr. PUGSLEY: The fact of it being there is evidently a printer's error.

Mr. CURRIE: That is a very worthy building, and it happens to be in a good Liberal town.

Mr. PUGSLEY: The building is only imaginary as yet.

Mr. CURRIE: Of course, if my friends on the opposite side of the House want the item struck out, it cannot be helped.

Mr. McKENZIE: What county is Stayner in?

Mr. CURRIE: It is the town of Stayner, which has done a lot for the war, and has never had a cent spent on it in its whole history. I think it is only right that the town should be recognized.

Mr. LEMIEUX: Let it wait until we have a union government.

[Mr. J. D. Reid.]

Mr. CURRIE: If we have a union government, of course the work will go on.

Mr. SINCLAIR: Are they all Liberals there?

Mr. CURRIE: As a matter of fact there is no truce now, as there was when the statement was made that no new building would be proceeded with. When that statement was made there was a political truce between the parties, but the situation is changed now. The Opposition has forced the Government to go to the country, and I do not see why it is absolutely necessary that the arrangement made then should be carried out. During the last two days I have heard nothing but abuse of the Government. Not a single item in the supplementary estimates passed without some blame being imputed to the Government. It was claimed the items were for a war-time election. If I had been the Minister of Public Works, I would have given a war-time supplementary estimate to hon. gentlemen opposite, and give them some excuse for kicking.

Mr. CARVELL: We think you would.

Mr. CURRIE: So did the hon. gentleman and there is no better politician or party man in this House than himself. As far as this public building in Stayner is concerned, if hon. gentlemen opposite are opposed to it, if they want it struck out and if there is any agreement to strike out, we will strike it out and let them take the blame.

St. John harbour—extension of and repairs to Negro Point breakwater, $250,000.

Mr. REID: This is the only item of the Public Works Department left. I cannot add anything to what I said except that the work will cost probably between $750,000 and $1,000,000 before it is completed. This is asked for the commencement of the work and so much will be spent per annum. I would suggest letting the item go through, and of course we would have to consider going on with the work in view of the statements which have been made by the hon. member for St. John (Mr. Pugsley) and the hon. member for Carleton (Mr. Carvell). If the committee desire further information I will let the item stand.

Mr. CURRIE: If there is anything in the argument that no new work should be undertaken during war time, it is unfair to strike out the item of $10,000 for Stayner and then ask to have a quarter of a million dollar item left in as hon. gentlemen opposite are asking.

Mr. CARVELL: No.

Mr. CURRIE: The hon. member for St. John is well known to be very friendly towards this item. This is new work and it is not needed at all. It can very well stand over during the war, and I think the minister should strike the item out. There is no argument in favour of it that I can see as far as the rest of the country is concerned.

Mr. REID: We will let the item stand.

Mr. CURRIE: I will be right here to fight it the next time it comes up.

Mr. McKENZIE: I am not here to fight for St. John—it can take care of itself—but there seems to be an argument in favour of leaving it in. The minister tells us that he has to call for tenders and that he is likely to accept one.

Mr. REID: I have not accepted any. Tenders were called for but no action was taken.

Mr. CARVELL: How many were received?

Mr. McKENZIE: It is not usual to ask for tenders and then strike out the item.

Mr. REID: Six regular tenders and four irregular.

Mr. CARVELL: Irregular in what way?

Mr. REID: We required a certified cheque with each tender, and no cheques were sent. Those that were irregular were considerably higher than the lowest tender that was regular. I can say that the lowest tender is not that of a New Brunswick firm.

Mr. MACDONALD: Why do you not tell us all about them and who they are?

Mr. REID: I would not have any objection except that I have just got a memorandum now from the deputy and the tenders have not been submitted to council. It is not customary to give information about a matter of this kind until it has been submitted to council.

Mr. PUGSLEY: If the item is to stand over for a day or two I would be agreeable, but otherwise I would like to present some very strong reasons for passing the item. This is a revote. The item was voted by Parliament two years ago and tenders were called by the minister for this work which was deemed very necessary and apparently essential for the protection of the harbour. Owing to the lowest tender being higher than the amount the minister thought he ought to expend, he decided to call for new tenders. New tenders were called for under the previous vote. This is really a revote.

Mr. CURRIE: Will the hon. gentleman tell me why it is not mentioned here that it is a revote? It says:

Extension of and repairs to Negro Point breakwater, $250,000.

Mr. PUGSLEY: I do not know; but my hon. friend will find that what I say is true. It may be that tenders were called for to be paid out of the general vote for St. John harbour.

Mr. REID: Yes, that is the reason.

Mr. PUGSLEY: I understand it was decided to make a change in the kind of stone that might be used. The previous tenders required that granite only should be used in the breakwater. A change was made in the hope that the tenders would be for a considerably lower amount. But, undoubtedly the vote in Parliament two years ago authorized the calling for tenders. The reason the work was not gone on with before was the belief that by making this change it would be done at a lower cost.

Mr. CARVELL: I am willing that the item should stand, but I do not go back on what I said last evening. This is a new work in my judgment and I want to be fairly consistent. I opposed the rest of the new works and I oppose this.

Mr. SINCLAIR: What is the use of allowing this item to stand if we will not embark upon any new work?

Mr. REID: The reason I ask that it be allowed to stand instead of striking it out is that I am only acting for the department and I would like to submit it to my colleagues.

Mr. SINCLAIR: It seems to be agreed that, the Minister of Finance having made that announcement, the committee is bound by it. I agree with my hon. friend from North Simcoe (Mr. Currie) that Stayner and St. John ought to be treated alike. I am prepared to vote to strike that item out.

Mr. PUGSLEY: I sincerely trust that the most my hon. friends would ask would be that the matter should stand a day or two so that it can be looked into. It is not a new work in the ordinary sense. The breakwater has been extended out from Negro point comparatively close to Partridge island. The department has done a lot of work, has built wharves, and the

opinion of experts is that the closing of this gap is necessary to protect the wharves and also the very large amount of shipping that is coming to the harbour and using these wharves on the western side. Therefore, this is simply carrying on a work which has been in progress for a number of years.

Mr. REID: My reason for asking it to stand is this: Tenders have been called for, they are in the department and I would not like to dispose of the matter without consulting my colleagues. We might allow the whole item to stand and I will bring it up when members are present without taking any advantage or asking it to be passed in their absence.

Mr. CURRIE: The hon. member for St. John wants to knock out a $10,000 item in Ontario, but he objects to the leaving out of an item for a quarter of a million dollars of which Ontario pays a large proportion. One item should stand against the other.

Mr. PUGSLEY: I would not do any injustice to any part of Ontario, or any other portion of Canada, but in the case of this building I have no doubt the post office is being carried on in rented premises. The land has not been purchased. The report says that the vote is required to purchase the land. The ex-Minister of Public Works last session dropped similar items with respect to public buildings and made the announcement that no public building would be undertaken while the war lasts.

Mr. CURRIE: Hundreds of thousands of dollars needed to repair docks and improve harbours in Ontario, but there has not been a dollar of new work put in. This condition at St. John has existed from time immemorial.

Mr. PUGSLEY: No.

Mr. CURRIE: There is no condition there that requires any change, and we could go on for three or four years more without having this work done. I quite agree with the hon. member that this is new work, and by what means of hocus-pocus that big item of a quarter of a million dollars can be put in these estimates, and even before it appears in the estimates tenders can be called for, is, I fancy, something entirely new in this department. This item is not urgent, and I think if one item stands the other should stand. If it is any money to be spent at St. John the late minister stands up for it, but he spends the time of this House trying to stick his knife into the items of other provinces, and I think it is time he was called in that respect—because if the rule is to be applied it should be applied all round. If it is a good rule, I am willing to abide by it; but let the hon. member for St. John abide by it and take the advice of his own colleagues and ask the minister to strike the item out.

Mr. PUGSLEY: My hon. friend is labouring under a very grave misapprehension. I did not try to stick a knife into—

Mr. CURRIE: You are, all the time.

Mr. PUGSLEY: I never did that. On the contrary, when I was minister and since that time, I have always encouraged development in all parts of Canada. See what has been done in the hon. member's own constituency, at Collingwood, and all through western Ontario. Very important works were constructed. I would appeal to representatives from these sections of Ontario as to whether or not I showed a generous spirit, not a niggardly spirit, in regard to improvements. The hon. member seems to think that conditions in St. John are what they have been for many years. That is not so. There has been a very large degree of harbour development there; a great deal of dredging has been done, and the wharves have been built lower down the harbour and nearer to the gap from which the southwesterly storms affect the harbour, and it becomes, so these experts say, necessary to protect—

Mr. CURRIE: What experts?

Mr. PUGSLEY: The enginers and people connected with the harbour, experts of the department. There is a vast deal of shipping coming to St. John. It would amaze the hon. member to know what is being shipped to Great Britain, largely munitions and supplies for the Allies. Many vessels with cargoes of enormous value sail from the harbour, and those familiar with the harbour assert that it is necessary to fill up the gap in order to protect the shipping now coming in such great quantities to the harbour, and also that it is necessary to protect the wharves upon which a large amount has been expended by the Government.

Mr. CURRIE: I think the whole item looks very suspicious. For that reason I think the best thing we can do is to strike it out altogether.

Mr. LEMIEUX: With the Canadian Northern?

Mr. CURRIE: Well.

Item stands.

Progress reported.

On motion of the Hon. Mr. Reid, the House adjourned at 12 o'clock midnight.

Thursday, September 6, 1917.

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

THE WAR-TIME ELECTIONS ACT.

INTRODUCTION OF THE BILL BY HON. ARTHUR MEIGHEN.

Hon. ARTHUR MEIGHEN (Secretary of State) moved for leave to introduce Bill No. 133, intituled, "The War-time Elections Act."

He said: Mr. Speaker, this Bill is in the name of the Prime Minister; it is very much to be regretted that owing to his illness he will not be here to expound its provisions. As it is not probable that he will return to the House for some little time at least, I have been asked to make the necessary explanation in his place. The Bill is of such importance that I think a departure might well be made from the usual custom of Parliament, and that I might state very fully to the House not only the scope and purpose of the Bill, but also, in very brief terms, what we deem to be its justification.

As the title would indicate, the scope of the Bill, so far as the period of its operation is concerned, is limited indeed. Its provisions are to operate only during the period of the present war and of demobilization thereafter. That is to say, so far as the Bill amends the Dominion Elections Act, it amends it only to cover the now apparently certain event of an election during the war or before demobilization. After that the Bill ceases to affect the Dominion Elections Act; the general law becomes the same as it was before, the same as it is to-day. The necessity for the Bill arises out of the precipitation of an election in time of war. But for that becoming inevitable, there would be no justification for the measure; therefore we must reflect first of all on the conditions that we find ourselves in, facing, as we do, an appeal to the electorate under the wholly unprecedented circumstances of this fearful war.

The first consideration that presents itself is the absence overseas of a large section of our male population. Some 300,000 of the foremost and bravest of our sons are abroad, engaged in the strife, the turmoil, the ordeal of war. A Military Voters' Act has been passed, the purpose of which is legally to enable those men to exercise the franchise should there be a contest in their absence. In that Act machinery is provided that goes as far as Parliament can go to make it physically possible for these men to avail themselves of the electoral privilege. Nevertheless, it is inevitable that a large number of them—nobody can say how large; it may be proportionately large, and it may not be so large as we anticipate—will not be able, no matter what machinery we have provided, to exercise that franchise. There are as well many thousands who are enlisted overseas, not in the Canadian overseas forces, but in the British forces. These men, though under the Military Voters' Act, they have, I understand, been given the right to vote, will inevitably in the main find it impossible to exercise that right. There are, besides, many thousands more who before the war were reservists in Canada—and some who were not reservists—who are to-day fighting in Europe or other continents the same battle in which we are engaged, but who are doing so as members of the Allied armies. They have not the legal right to vote; if they had it, they could not possibly exercise the franchise. An election is to be held at a time when the most deserving, the bone, sinew and virility of our country, are only partially at least enabled to take part in the contest by way of voting. There are also thousands who have fallen in battle, whose voices are stilled. There are, besides these, some thousands who are prisoners of war. Their voices also are silent; under no imaginable circumstances could they take advantage of the Military Voters' Act.

Nor can we forget what is a more potent fact still; that each and all of the men overseas are stripped of the influence which under normal circumstances they could exert among their fellows in an election contest.

That personal force, that persuasive power, that electoral influence which, particularly appertaining to men of the nature of those who are overseas, is indeed a potent factor in any contest. That great factor is eliminated. On the contrary those at home—those who should be here and those at home who should not be here, are normally left in the full enjoyment of their electoral rights and

privileges, and are enabled to exercise them to exert a control over the destinies of our defenders overseas.

Very briefly stated those are the main facts of the situation that confronts us, and they are sufficient, I think, to bring home to the mind of every member of this House the certain truth that on the franchise as it stands to-day, on what may be described as a peace franchise, a very grave and a very gross injustice will be done to those men. The injustice is done not only to them but it is brought home to Canada. The injustice really is done to the Canadian nation, should an election take place on the franchise as it stands to-day, eliminating the influence of these men, eliminating entirely the voice of those who have fallen and are prisoners, eliminating entirely the voice of those who fight in the Allied forces but were formerly citizens of this country, stripping entirely those men of the personal force which they should of right exert.

It is mainly to meet those conditions that the Bill, which I now have the honour to move to introduce, is brought before this House. The measure constitutes an attempt to repair, so far as Parliament can repair, the injustice which I have described as falling under present legislation on our overseas forces, and ultimately on Canada herself. The only method of reaching a result that may be said best to represent or to re-echo the voice of our soldiers abroad is to reach their representatives at home. If the direct vote cannot be obtained, if the direct influence cannot be obtained, then the best way to repair that injustice, at all events the only way that seems available, is to reach such of their kin at home who can best be said to be likely to vote in such a way and to influence the electors in such a way as they themselves would do were they upon our shores. Consequently, this Bill provides a measure of woman enfranchisement which endeavours to attain that end.

It will be remembered that earlier in this session the Prime Minister intimated to the House that there would be a measure of woman suffrage should an election appear in sight, a measure of woman suffrage granted under such conditions and limitations as Parliament might provide. Parliament is now facing the necessity of providing those limitations. In this connection hon. members should keep especially in mind the fact that a very substantial portion of the women of this country who are now British subjects, and who, under any general scheme of enfranchisement would be entitled to vote, have become British subjects by a process of constructive naturalizaton, by the naturalization of a parent, or by marriage. Remembering this, it seems very plain, indeed, that it would be unfair and unreasonable at this time, and under the shadow of this war, that an unlimited woman suffrage should be granted. The necessity, then, of drawing a line is at once upon us, and it has been decided, and it is embodied in this Bill, that the line so to be drawn shall be the line of service. Not only do those who are nearest of kin to the overseas forces more likely represent in sentiment and in purpose the voice and will of those who are fighting for us, but also those whose sons, whose brothers, and whose husbands have gone to the battlefield, have given a service and made a sacrifice in this war of a character higher and greater than that which any other person is able to give or to make. Consequently, on the ground not only of their representative capacity, but of the service and sacrifice which they have rendered, it is not unjust or unfair that those nearest of kin to our soldiers overseas should be given special recognition at this time.

The Bill, therefore, provides that the wives, the widows, the mothers, the sisters, and the daughters of the members past or present of the actual overseas force shall have the right to vote in the war-time election. This privilege does not extend to such relatives of those of our expeditionary forces as have not gone overseas. They are still with us, and the same reasoning does not apply to them. They, of course, can vote, but their relatives are not enfranchised.

The Bill has another aspect which I shall now explain. In this country we have a substantial portion of our population who are of alien enemy birth, or alien enemy blood, or near extraction. Many of these people have been citizens of Canada for a great number of years; many of them have become accustomed to our institutions, and as years have gone by they doubtless have been more and more divorced in sympathy from the land of their nativity. But, on the other hand, there are a large number who are comparatively recent arrivals in this country, and who consequently have not the same sense of Canadian and British nationality as have we, and who cannot be expected to have wholly separated themselves from the sympathies and predispositions which governed them in the land

whence they came. Furthermore, inasmuch as war service should be the basis of war franchise, and inasmuch as from the commencement of this war, not only in Canada, but in Great Britain, it has been found undesirable and unwise to accept those of the citizens of the class I have described for the highest service of war, it does not seem unreasonable that they should not exercise, during the war, that control of our destinies which is vested in the franchise. It is in a sense unfair to those men themselves, many of whose sons and brothers are fighting in armies in Europe against us, that they should be asked to take up the real war burden and go to battle against their next of kin. It is also unfair to them that in the midst of such a war they should be called upon to determine by their vote the vigour, or the direction, which that war should take, while their next of kin and their brothers, or their sons, are fighting in the armies against us. That argument has been advanced to us by some of this class themselves.

Not only is it unfair to them that they should be asked to decide the destiny and the vigour of a war against their brothers in Europe, but it is unfair to the rest of the population that they should have the right to so decide. I am quite free to admit, that, taken all in all, those who come from alien enemy countries have, in the main, during the progress of this war, conducted themselves satisfactorily within lines of obedience to the laws of Canada. It is not based on any complaint of that kind that the principle embodied in this Bill is adopted. It is because of the reasons I have mentioned, namely, that those who cannot in the nature of things be absolutely divorced in sympathy or sentiment from the peoples from whom they come should not be permitted, in justice to the rest of the population, to exercise a measure of control over the destinies of the war against those peoples, because it would be unfair to them to ask them to go to the polls and vote on an issue which decides to a degree the vigour, the purpose and the destiny of that war. It is also because war service should be the basis of war franchise. The two should go hand in hand—the obligation and the privilege. If, for reasons special to themselves, these people are not in a position to render war service of the highest kind they should not be entitled to the franchise while the war is on.

There has not occurred as yet in any great country engaged in this struggle of unprecedented dimensions a general election. Where democracy governs nations in this war, it has not as yet left to individualism, by means of the ballot, the determination of the conduct of the war, save in one country alone. That country is Australia. When they were, in Australia, facing a situation such as we face to-day, but by no means as aggravated as ours, they prepared by legislation for the contest along lines similar to those of this Bill. They, however, disqualified for the war time election all of their citizens who were of alien enemy birth no matter how long they had been in Australia or how long they had been naturalized. This Bill does not go that far. This Bill disqualifies, for the war time election, those of alien enemy birth, or of other European birth and of alien enemy mother tongue or native language, who have been naturalized since the 31st March 1902. All who were naturalized prior to that date remain in the enjoyment of the exercise of the franchise. In Australia they made exceptions of any who had sons or brothers enlisted in the overseas forces engaged in the war. In Canada we allow the exception to go further and we admit to the franchise any whose sons or grandsons or brothers are enlisted in the overseas forces. There was an exception also in Australia of Armenians and Syrians known to be entirely out of sympathy with Turkey. We are making the same exception here. But, for the wider exceptions which I have named, our law in this regard follows the lines of the Australian law. As far as the franchise is concerned, these constitute the two fundamental changes brought about by this Bill.

It is further to be noted that whosoever is disqualified from voting by this measure is at the same time exempted entirely from combatant service in the war.

Heretofore the Dominion franchise has been, in seven provinces of Canada, the provincial franchise. Whomsoever the provincial legislatures admitted to the franchise was admitted to the franchise in a Dominion contest, save in Alberta, Saskatchewan and the Yukon. In those provinces and that territory, there has always been a Dominion franchise; that is a Dominion qualification for admission to the franchise at Dominion elections. By this Bill the provincial franchise is adopted in every province of Canada including Alberta and Saskatchewan. It cannot, of course, be adopted in the Yukon as there is no Yukon franchise.

Sir SAM HUGHES: The provincial franchise?

Mr. MEIGHEN: The provincial franchise, subject to the operation of the two principles I have described in the foregoing part of my address, is adopted in every province including Alberta and Saskatchewan.

Franchise, of course, is one thing and list making is another. The alterations in the franchise, described in that portion of the Bill dealing with the franchise which alterations I have endeavoured to explain so far, were such that there had to be variations in the elections Act to enable the lists to be made. For example, in British Columbia and Manitoba, the lists that are now made contain the names of all women as well as of men; consequently we have addressed ourselves to the task of providing for the making a list to meet the franchise requirements of this legislation. In the provinces of Alberta and Saskatchewan there are no provincial lists and by our own Dominion Elections Act, which has been in force since 1905—indeed, I think before—the Dominion provides machinery for the making of the lists. By this Act the machinery which heretofore has been applicable only to the provinces of Alberta and Saskatchewan is made applicable to all those provinces where the present lists are such that new lists are necessary; namely to the four western provinces of British Columbia, Alberta, Saskatchewan and Manitoba and as well to Prince Edward Island. It was impossible to use any lists to be found in those provinces and consequently the machinery which has been in force for twelve years as to the provision of lists in Alberta and Saskatchewan is made applicable to the other three provinces.

This application, however, is subject to certain safeguards that have not heretofore existed. In the provinces of Alberta and Saskatchewan the lists are made by enumerators appointed by the Governor in Council or by returning officers, and are posted up eight days before the polling day and then are subject to certain revision by enumerators up to two days before the polling day when they are final, save with this proviso, that any voter can go to the polls on polling day and by taking the oath that he has the right to vote, cast his ballot in the same way as can any other voter who is on the list. That has been the law all along in these two provinces. In the province of Alberta there has been for provincial contests a partial safeguard provided against the practice of swearing in votes on election day.

We adopt in principle the safeguard so provided, but we extend it. I shall describe that safeguard as we adopt it. Wherever a voter is not on the list as made up by the enumerator and claims a right to vote and swears that he has a right to vote, he is on being refused able to go in and vote on election day. He is first entitled to and receives a certificate of refusal from the enumerator. He makes an affidavit of his right, His vote, however, is placed in an envelope, and on any recount, should it appear that there are enough votes placed in envelopes to affect a recount, the right to that vote is reviewed by a judge, and the vote is allowed if the voter had the right. Such is, substantially, the safeguard that has heretofore obtained in provincial elections in Alberta.

We, however, extend that safeguard much further. Not only may a man vote to whom the enumerator has refused a vote—his vote to go in an envelope and be afterwards judicially reviewed, but the vote of any man who is put on by an enumerator and whom the agent of any candidate claims should not be put on may be challenged by that agent by affidavit asserting his belief that the voter has not the right to vote and giving the reasons. If the agent does so that vote also goes in an envelope and is subject to the very same review. Consequently it will be seen that, while we adopt the provisions of the provinces of Saskatchewan and Alberta which have been in effect by Dominion legislation since 1905, we adopt safeguards against any work of the enumerator that might be objected to, with the ultimate result that the whole of the enumerator's work may, if desired, be subjected to judicial revision. It will, I think, appear to all that the objections that have heretofore been levelled, with some force, against the list-making provisions enacted in this House and applicable to Alberta and Saskatchewan, are eliminated in this Bill, and that such safeguards are provided as will render the making and operation of those lists absolutely fair.

I have covered the method so far as it applies to the four western provinces and Prince Edward Island. There are left the provinces of Ontario and Quebec, New Brunswick and Nova Scotia. In those provinces the women are not on the list last made up. In the province of Ontario the list last made up was prepared last fall and completed, I believe, in December. It

is only a male list. That list has also been judicially reviewed according to the Ontario law, and there is no reason for throwing it away and making a new list by enumerators. My words in that regard apply only to the counties of Ontario and to towns up to 9,000 population. In towns over 9,000 and in cities, there are no completed lists. Consequently, as to towns and cities in Ontario, another method of making the list has to be devised. First let me deal with the counties of Ontario. In the counties of Ontario there is a list covering all places except towns and cities over 9,000 population. That list has been made up and was revised judicially last December.

In Quebec, in the cities of Montreal and Quebec, there are also completed lists, and in all the rest of Quebec there are lists now approaching completion, and to be completed this month. Those lists should be kept in mind in conjunction with the Ontario lists in counties, because all are treated the same. Similarly in New Brunswick and Nova Scotia there are lists now complete.

The lists so made up of male voters all judicially revised in Ontario and Quebec and revised by the provincial methods in Nova Scotia and New Brunswick, are by this Bill adopted, so far as they go. The only requirement as to them is to add such of the women as by this Bill are to be entitled to vote and to substract such of the men, if any, as, by reason of alienage, should not be entitled to vote. This is done by means of a system of enumeration similar to that adopted in the other provinces. The names of women are enumerated along the lines of the present Ontario Act. I am not speaking now of the cities of Ontario; I shall ask hon. members to forget the cities of Ontario until I get through with the counties of Ontario and with the provinces of Quebec, New Brunswick and Nova Scotia. As regards these latter the lists are adopted and the enumeration only goes to the adding of the names of the additional women now entitled to vote and to the striking off of those who by reason of alienage, and nothing else, are disentitled to vote. That is the province and duty of the registrars or enumerators, whatever you call them, and that alone. They cannot in other respects affect those lists.. The work of the enumerators to that extent, namely the adding of the women and the taking off of the men by reason of alienage, is subject to the same safeguards on election day as obtain in the four western provinces and in Prince Edward Island. That is to say, any one who is taken off by the enumerator and claims the right to vote, may, by taking the necessary oath on election day, vote, and his vote goes in an envelope; and if any one has not been put on by an enumerator and claims the right to vote —and it must be a woman of course because no one else has the right to be put on—she may go and assert her claim, and if the enumerator refuses it she may vote and her vote goes in an envelope. The vote of any one claimed to be wrongfully put on may be challenged, and it will then go into the protested lists and be subject, as all other protested votes, to revision.

I now come to the cities of Ontario. But perhaps I should first repeat that there is no review of what has already been reviewed; that is to say, of the lists as already made up in the counties of Ontario, in Quebec, in New Brunswick, and in Nova Scotia. There is no review of those lists except, of course, so far as the work of the enumerator goes, and the enumerator has power only to add the women vote and to strike off by reason of alienage. He can strike off for no other cause.. That work and that alone is subject to final review by a judge. The rest of the list is already completed and revised, and that stands for this election.

Coming to the cities of Ontario, the lists made up for those cities are only partial. Under the Ontario law towns and cities of over 9,000 population make up what they call part one and part two, which do not contain the manhood suffrage voters. Consequently, those lists cannot be used in any sense as final lists, the same as in the counties in Ontario, and the lists for the provinces of Quebec, New Brunswick and Nova Scotia.

Therefore in Ontario, in cities of over 9,000, lists have to be made. The method adopted is virtually that provided by provincial legislation. Men are appointed whose duty it is, similarly as under the provincial legislation, to enumerate the voters in those cities, and to make out lists, and those lists so made out are revised immediately they are completed by a Board of Revision, precisely the same Board of Revision as now revises in Ontario. I think it is composed of a judge and some other of the higher officers. At all events, there is judicial revision. That is to say, in towns and cities of Ontario of over 9,000, where

the lists are to be made, they are made up entirely, and they are subjected to the same judicial review as now obtains in those towns and cities under provincial legislation.

I may add further—and this applies to the whole of this list making from coast to coast—that wherever the enumerators have the duty of making up lists they are permitted by the Act to use as a basis any lists already made up, so far as they can be used. Using these, so far as they go, as a basis, of course, is one thing, and making the lists complete is another thing.

Looking over the whole measure, so far as these list-making provisions are concerned, it has subjected the existing law to as little change as possible, and only where it is essential that such change should be made in order to get lists conforming to the franchise requirements of the Bill. Such is the spirit of the measure that there can be no lists for this contest that will not be, either before or after, in the method I have described, judicially revised.

I may add that the desire has been—and if the Bill does not fully carry out that desire, amendments to that end will be welcomed—that all provision for list-making shall be absolutely fair, and that no party advantage shall be taken. We have to make provision for the making of these lists within such reasonable time as will make the period of the election contest not unconscionably long. Consequently it is necessary, in the cities of Ontario particularly, that while we adopt the provincial plan, we make more expeditious the preparing of the list and the revision.

Subject to the necessity of not extending too long the turmoil and too far the expense of a contest, and, therefore, the necessity of bringing the list-making to an end as soon as could be done consistently with fairness and thoroughness, this Bill has, I think, omitted no safeguard.

I repeat, that the necessity of the Bill is brought upon us by the precipitation of a contest in time of war. That, in our judgment, necessitates the changes in the franchise which this Bill proposes. These changes necessitate provision for a method of making the lists where no lists at present are in existence that can be of any practical value in this contest, and to supplement lists where necessary, and only to that extent is there any change whatever.

The purpose of the Bill is to endeavour that this contest shall be conducted in such a way, and by such a method, as will do justice to those to whom the best of justice must be done, namely, the defenders of our country; to see to it that the voice of Canada, as heard in this contest, shall express the real views of the Canadian people, and that such injustice as would be done by the present franchise to the best of our sons and to the nation itself, is repaired, so far as Parliament can repair it.

Mr. GUTHRIE: Does the Bill make any provision in regard to that class of people who may be known as conscientious objectors to military service?

Mr. MEIGHEN: Yes, I said that we had endeavoured to frame the Bill on the principle that war service or the obligation of war service should be the foundation of war franchise, and, that principle has a bearing on that class of our population known as conscientious objectors. The Bill provides that all those exempted from military service by the section of the Military Service Act which applies to certain Doukhobor and Mennonite immigrants shall be disqualified for this contest, and also, that all others who have applied for and have not been refused exemption from combatant service in the war on conscientious grounds are disqualified from voting. If, of course, such men are refused they have the right to vote. The Bill further provides that any who vote in the contest shall not thereafter be entitled to exemption on conscientious grounds. It seems entirely unfair that those who, for reasons special to themselves, are freed entirely from the burden and sacrifice of this war, in so far as the real sacrifice of war goes, should have a say in deciding the character and turn the war may take.

The Bill goes further and provides that any who have been convicted of an offence under the Military Service Act shall thereafter for this election be disqualified.

I have now enumerated the main features of the legislation. I should have said that, as there are no lists in the unorganized districts of Ontario, it is deemed best that the unorganized districts of Ontario should have lists made up, on the same basis as the four western provinces.

Mr. LEMIEUX: Is there any provision as to the age limit for the women voters?

Mr. MEIGHEN: All women voters must be as to age, race and residence, qualified in accordance with the laws of the provinces where they reside.

Mr. GLASS: I should like to ask the minister if any provision has been made in

regard to the female relatives of soldiers who are overseas, some 50,000 or so?

Mr. MEIGHEN: That matter has been fully explained. They have a right to vote.

Sir WILFRID LAURIER: I do not rise on this occasion to discuss the merits of the measure which has just been introduced by the Secretary of State; I simply rise for the purpose of asking questions on some points which I think I have rightly understood, because the statement of my hon. friend was lucid, but I desire to be doubly sure.

I understand from my hon. friend that he has taken the provincial franchise qualifications as the basis of the measure which he has just introduced. If I understand him aright, he has made quite a departure from those qualifications, because, in five provinces, Ontario, Manitoba, Saskatchewan, Alberta and British Columbia, women have now the franchise, but, under this legislation, the women of those provinces, with the exception of those who happen to be relatives of men who have enlisted, are deprived of the franchise. Am I right in that?

Mr. MEIGHEN: Yes. Except for the two main features of the Bill, the enfranchisement of women relatives of soldiers and the disfranchisement of recently arrived persons of alien enemy birth or extraction, and conscientious objectors, the provincial franchise is adopted.

Sir WILFRID LAURIER: Am I right in this: that while the women of Ontario and the western provinces have to-day, under the laws of those provinces, the right to vote, they will, with the exception of those who are qualified as the relatives of men who have enlisted, not have the right to vote in this election?

Mr. MEIGHEN: That is correct.

Sir WILFRID LAURIER: It was understood on this side of the House, when my hon. friend from St. John (Mr. Pugsley) drew attention to the matter, that, in the next election, the women would have the franchise. Under this legislation, in Quebec, New Brunswick, Nova Scotia and Prince Edward Island, where women have not the right to vote, those women who happen to be relatives of soldiers will have the right to exercise the franchise. To this extent the provincial franchise is interfered with. I thought I understood the measure correctly, and I see I am right. Did I understand my hon. friend to say that Assyrians and Armenians, who are naturalized British subjects, were to be deprived of the franchise?

Mr. MEIGHEN: No. They will have the franchise.

Sir WILFRID LAURIER: I am glad to hear that. In regard to Ontario, I understand that my hon. friend takes, as the franchise list, the list made up in the month of December of last year under
4 p.m. the Act which was repealed recently by the provincial legislature. The province of Ontario has provided for a new franchise, the vote being given to the women, and for a new method of making up the list. I understood from a cursory reading of this Act that the former Act was abolished and was no longer in force; but my hon. friend, if I understand him aright, takes the list made up in the month of December last and makes it the basis of this measure.

Mr. MEIGHEN: That is correct.

Motion agreed to, and Bill read the first time.

The SPEAKER: When shall the Bill be read the second time?

Some hon. MEMBERS: Now.

Mr. MEIGHEN: To-morrow.

Sir WILFRID LAURIER: I dare say that the Bill will not be ready until to-morrow. We should have some time to look over it.

Mr. MEIGHEN: The Bill will be ready to-morrow.

Sir WILFRID LAURIER: But I do not expect it will be discussed to-morrow; it is a very important measure.

Mr. MEIGHEN: We would prefer to take it up to-morrow, as there is very little other work for Parliament to do. That is why we desire to take it up.

Sir WILFRID LAURIER: I am sorry the measure was brought down so late, but, as it is a very imporant measure, I object to its being taken up to-morrow.

FIRST READING OF SENATE BILL.

Bill No. 131, to incorporate The Army and Navy Veterans in Canada.—Mr. Bradbury.

QUESTIONS.

(Questions answered orally are indicated by asterisks).

LIEUTENANT WILLIAM GIBSON.

Mr. PROULX:

1. Is Lieutenant Wm. Gibson County Registrar in Kingston?
2. Is he drawing salary as a military officer?
3. If so, where is he located?
4. Is he also drawing his salary as Registrar?
5. Could not the duties he is performing for the militia be performed by a returned soldier?

Mr. MEIGHEN:

1. The county registrar is a provincial and not a Dominion official. We have no information.
2. Yes, employed in internment duties.
3. Camp Kapuskasing, Ontario.
4. Answered by No. 1.
5. Lieut. Gibson is acting in the capacity of quartermaster at Camp Kapuskasing, where the duties are not light, there being about 600 prisoners there, divided into two classes, workers and non-workers, in addition to the troops required for guarding same and working parties. The D.O.C. of the district has instructions to employ a returned soldier in Lieut. Gibson's stead as soon as one of the necessary capacity is available.

MR. M. A. McINNIS.

Mr. NEELY:

1. What are the duties of Mr. M. A. McInnis, assistant to Mr. McGrath, Fuel Controller?
2. What is the salary of Mr. McInnis?
3. Has he special qualifications for this class of work?

Sir GEORGE FOSTER:

1. Mr. M. A. McInnis is no longer on the staff of the fuel controller. He was employed for a period of two months on special technical investigation.
2. $200 per month.
3. Yes.

MAJOR LEIGH.

Mr. GAUVREAU:

1. What is Major Leigh's position or duties in military work in the province of Prince Edward Island, and what remuneration does he receive?
2. What is the total amount received by him since the beginning of the war till the present time?

Sir EDWARD KEMP:

1. Officer commanding artillery and infantry depots; $6.50 per diem pay and allowances.
2. $4,163.46.

[Mr. Bradbury.]

MAJOR BARTLETT.

Mr. GAUVREAU:

1. What is Major Bartlett's position or duties in military work in the province of Prince Edward Island, and what remuneration does he receive?
2. What is the total amount received by him since the beginning of the war till the present time?

Sir EDWARD KEMP:

1. Officer in charge of supplies, transport and barracks at Charlottetown, P.E.I.; $4 per diem.
2. $4,809.30.

LIEUTENANT-COLONEL S. R. JENKINS.

Mr. GAUVREAU:

1. What salary or remuneration does Dr. S. R. Jenkins, of Charlottetown, P.E.I., receive as Lieut-Colonel, and what are his duties in this connection?
2. How much does Dr. S. R. Jenkins receive for examining recruits, and what is the total amount received by him since the war began till the present time, both in salary and for examining recruits?
3. Has Dr. S. R. Jenkins an orderly? If so, what does said orderly receive, and what is his name?
4. Has Dr. S. R. Jenkins a stenographer or private secretary? If so, what is his or her name, and is the remuneration paid by the Dominion Government?

Sir EDWARD KEMP:

1. $4 per diem; Medical officer in charge of troops, Charlottetown, attending to troops located at Summerside and Souris, also looks after returned soldiers at the Dalton Sanatorium. Lt.-Col. Jenkins also attends all medical boards.
2. Nothing at present for examining recruits. Pay and allowances, $2,486.94; examining recruits in 1915 when not drawing other remuneration, $166.62; total $2,653.56.
3. No.
4. Yes; Miss Nora Jenkins—$2.50 per week while employed, including use of machine.

CAPTAIN R. V. HARRIS.

Mr. PROULX:

1. Has Captain R. V. Harris been attached to Military Headquarters, District No. 6, at Halifax, N.S.?
2. If so, are his services actually needed?
3. What is the nature of the services being performed by Captain Harris, and what pay does he receive?

Sir EDWARD KEMP:

1. Yes.
2. Yes.
3. (a) District casualty officer; (b) pay of rank, $3; field allowance, 75 cents; subsistence, $1.50, $5.25 per diem.

NOVA SCOTIA PATROL SERVICE.

Mr. A. K. MACLEAN:

1. How many officers, men and boats, respectively, are in the Canadian Patrol service at Halifax or elsewhere in Nova Scotia?
2. What is the usual size of the boat so employed and the number of officers and men assigned to each boat?
3. What is the pay allowance to officers and men, respectively?
4. What is the nature of the services performed by the patrol service boat, and where are such services performed?
5. Is it proposed to further enlarge this service? If so, to what extent?

Mr. HAZEN: 1 and 2. It is not advisable to publish the information asked by these questions under present conditions.

3. Pay and allowances same as authorized by Orders in Council, which have been laid upon the table of the House.

4 and 5. Answer same as Nos. 1 and 2.

REPORTED INCREASE IN PENSIONS.

On the Orders of the Day:

Sir THOMAS WHITE (Minister of Finance): My attention has been drawn to this despatch appearing in certain newspapers as coming from Toronto under date of September 5:

A sixty per cent increase in the pensions to be paid members of the Canadian Expeditionary Force is to be granted by an Order in Council to be passed in Ottawa within the next few weeks.

This Dominion Government announcement of such a large pension increase, amounting to many millions of dollars, was made to local officers of the G.W.V.A. by the Cabinet at Ottawa, according to their statement here.

I desire to say, as this report appears to have received wide circulation and currency, that there is no foundation for it. The question of the amount of increase in pensions has not been determined, and no intimation nor statement has been given or made by the Government respecting such increase.

CERTIFICATES TO THOSE MEDICALLY UNFIT.

On the orders of the Day:

Mr. E. M. MACDONALD (Pictou): I have seen it stated in the press that certificates are shortly to be given to those men who have offered to enlist, but who have been refused on account of medical unfitness. Can the Minister of Militia say if that is a fact? Has any list been kept by the Militia Department of those who offered to enlist and were refused. If the minister has any such list, can he give to the House the number of such men?

Sir EDWARD KEMP: I will look up my hon. friend's question in Hansard to-morrow. I am not prepared to give an answer to-day.

Mr. MACDONALD: The minister will do so to-morrow?

Sir EDWARD KEMP: I will try to give my hon. friend an answer to-morrow or the next day.

OVERSEAS EXPEDITIONARY FORCE.

PAY OF SOLDIERS PROMOTED AND OF OFFICERS WHO REVERT IN RANK.

On the Orders of the Day:

Mr. F. B. CARVELL (Carleton): I wish to ask the Minister of Militia whether it is a fact that men who have been promoted on the field in France and Flanders, and who, having been wounded, return to the base or to Canada, receive only the pay of the position which they occupied when they left Canada, while men who received their appointment in England or in Canada, upon being wounded, receive the pay of their present rank.

Sir EDWARD KEMP: I will get my hon. friend an answer as soon as I can get the particulars from the department.

Sir SAM HUGHES: I understand that officers who revert to lower rank in order to get to the front were at one time entitled, upon so reverting in rank, to receive the pay of their previous rank. I believe that that practice has been discontinued, and that the men now receive the pay of the rank to which they revert. When the minister is looking up the information asked for by the member for Pictou (Mr. Macdonald) and the member for Carleton (Mr. Carvell), he might give me some information with regard to this matter.

Sir EDWARD KEMP: I will have the matter looked into.

ARRESTS IN MONTREAL.

On the Orders of the Day:

Hon. RODOLPHE LEMIEUX (Rouville): I wish to direct the attention of the Minister of Justice to the arrests that have been made in Montreal in connection with the dynamite outrages. I see by the press that at least three of the men arrested were old jailbirds, who were not long ago released on ticket-of-leave. Their names are: Blackwell, Monette, and Handfield, alias Leduc. Is that a fact?

Mr. DOHERTY: I am not clear that there were three who had been previously released on ticket-of-leave. I have been informed that of the three mentioned, two had been under sentence and were released on ticket-of-leave.

Mr. LEMIEUX: Lately?

Mr. DOHERTY: Not very long ago; within a few months. I can give the exact information if my hon. friend desires it.

Mr. LEMIEUX: Will my hon. friend be good enough to lay the information on the table of the House?

Mr. DOHERTY: Yes.

SALUTES TO OFFICERS.

On the Orders of the Day:

Hon. FRANK OLIVER (Edmonton): I have noticed in the newspapers the statement that orders have recently been issued requiring all soldiers in London to salute all officers whom they may meet at any time or under any circumstances.

Sir SAM HUGHES: Even with ladies.

Mr. OLIVER: I wish to know whether that order was issued by the Minister of Militia and Defence, or by the overseas minister. Is the minister aware that the number of officers who are running loose on the streets of London, England, and not discharging valuable duties, is a disgrace to the Dominion of Canada?

Mr. SPEAKER: Order. The hon. member is exceeding by far his privileges.

Sir EDWARD KEMP: With regard to the former part of my hon. friend's remarks, I would say that it is proper and right that members of the rank and file should salute commissioned officers when they meet them on the streets in any part of the Empire.

Sir SAM HUGHES: Is it not the bounden duty of any officer to salute a private?

Sir EDWARD KEMP: Certainly; his duty is to return a salute. The member for Edmonton did not raise that question.

SUGGESTED REVISION OF PENSIONS SCALE.

On the Orders of the Day:

Mr. J. G. TURRIFF (Assiniboia): The Minister of Finance (Sir Thomas White) made reference to the fact that the matter of increase of pensions to soldiers was under consideration. I would suggest to the minister that when this matter is being considered something should be done along the line of equalizing the pensions paid to privates and to officers. A general feeling exists throughout the country that the disparity between the amount paid to an officer and the amount paid to a private is too great.

WAR CHARITIES ACT.

Sir THOMAS WHITE (Minister of Finance) moved the second reading of Bill No. 130, relating to war charities.

Mr. SPEAKER: Is it the pleasure of the House to adopt the motion? Carried.

Mr. MACDONALD: Will the minister explain this Bill? Nobody has a copy of it.

Mr. SPEAKER: I declared the motion carried, but there is no objection to the hon. member speaking if the House consents.

Mr. PUGSLEY: The Bill is not yet distributed.

Sir THOMAS WHITE: I had intended to explain the Bill in Committee. The Bill was introduced into and passed by the Senate, and has now come to the House of Commons in my name. The statement was made that the Bill had not been distributed. I perceive by the Order of the Day, No. 21, that it has been printed in English and in French; I understood that it had been distributed. The Bill is of a comparatively unimportant character, and I think it is not necessary that there should be any delay. Its object is to provide that organizations making appeals to the public for war charities or alleged war charities must be registered under the provisions of this Act with the Secretary of State, or must obtain, in a simple manner provided in the Act, exemption from such registration by the Secretary of State. In other words, the object of the Bill is to protect the public against possible frauds by those representing themselves as acting for war charities.

Motion agreed to, and Bill read the second time.

The House went into Committee on the Bill, Mr. Rainville in the Chair.

On section 1—Short title:

Mr. PUGSLEY: This Bill seems to be of considerable importance, and I think it is objectionable that it should be considered in Committee before copies have been distributed. I have just this moment received a copy. I do not think the min-

ister should proceed to the consideration of the Bill in Committee to-day. Members of the Committee are entitled to know the nature of a Bill before it is considered in Committee.

Sir THOMAS WHITE: This Bill has been upon the Order Paper for some little time, and I was not aware of the fact that it had not been distributed. If hon. members think that under the circumstances we should not take up the Bill in Committee to-day, I am willing to suggest that the Committee should rise. The Bill has been printed and has been distributed.

Mr. PUGSLEY: I have a file of all the Bills distributed. The Bill now before us came to me within the last few minutes.

Sir THOMAS WHITE: It is on my file.

Mr. PUGSLEY: It is not on mine.

Sir THOMAS WHITE: It is on mine, and I do not think I have had any preferential treatment.

Sir WILFRID LAURIER: My hon. friend has been better served than members on this side. It is not on my file.

Sir THOMAS WHITE: Under the circumstances, as there is evidently a mistake, I would suggest that the Committee rise, report progress, and ask leave to sit again.

Progress reported.

MEAT AND CANNED FOODS ACT.

CONSIDERATION OF AMENDMENTS MADE BY THE SENATE.

House proceeded to consider the amendments made by the Senate to Bill No. 73, to amend the Meat and Canned Foods Act.—Mr. Hazen.

Hon. Mr. HAZEN moved that the amendments made by the Senate be concurred in.

Mr. MACDONALD: This Bill went through the House originally under conditions which provided for extremely onerous changes in connection with the lobster-packing industry. The attention of the House was not directed very closely to the changes, but on the matter coming before the Senate the wholesale effect upon the industry was pointed out, and it was indicated that those changes were of the most radical character and I am advised by gentlemen in my constituency who are connected with the industry and to whom the matter was referred, that the proposals made by the department in regard to them, as contained in the Bill originally, were of a character that would involve a serious disarrangement of the industry and a very large expenditure of money in connection with carrying out the details of the Bill. The objections which were urged in the Senate to this particular phase of the question were of the most energetic character and the whole case made by the senators from Prince Edward Island who discussed the proposed Act indicated that the effect of this measure would be of the most serious character. Under all these circumstances the House should pay very careful attention to the amendments that have been made by the Senate and I trust that the minister will, at some length and in the clearest possible way, tell us exactly the effect of the legislation as it comes from the Senate.

Incidentally, I would like to ask if the action of the minister in arranging new seasons for catching lobster this year has met with the approval of those engaged in the industry. The extension of the season which, I understand, has been made till the tenth of this month, is also objectionable. I understand that the ground upon which it was done was the desire to increase the supply of food. There was no necessity for any such action in regard to the matter of food. I was amused at some of our good friends in Toronto calling it a perfectly wonderful performance that a car load of good fish had been brought up from the Maritime Provinces through the food controller to Toronto and sold at an extraordinary low rate as though the good people of Toronto and Ontario, who are apt to dictate to the rest of us, had heard for the first time that there are unlimited quantities of fish in the Maritime Provinces. The action of the minister in extending the time for the purpose of providing more food was entirely unnecessary because any one who knows the conditions in the Maritime Provinces knows that the whole thing is a matter of transportation. At this time there is no reason why the conditions should be disrupted with the result that a heavy additional burden will be put upon the people engaged in the fishing industry.

In view of the fact that this measure passed this House without full attention being paid to it, very difficult and almost impossible conditions, as far as the industry is concerned, have been imposed by the Bill and in view of the fact that the Senate very

wisely and properly went into the Bill in the fullest possible way, the House is entitled to the most complete explanation from the minister in regard to every detail of the Bill.

Mr. HAZEN: The hon. member or Pictou (Mr. Macdonald), I am afraid, has received some incorrect information in regard to this Bill. There was no intention of imposing any onerous or improper conditions on people engaged in the business of packing lobsters. The Bill, as it came from the department, did not impose any such onerous conditions. The Bill was necessary because the work of inspecting establishments where fish is canned under the Meat and Canned Foods Act has been transferred to the Department of Marine and Fisheries. It was necessary, in order that the work might be carried on properly, that the law should be clearly defined. The Bill, as it came from the Department of Marine and Fisheries—and this is the only amendment made by the Senate—provided that:

> Cans of lobster shall contain the following minimum amounts of dry lobster meat:
> A one-pound can, 13 ounces, avoirdupois;
> A three-quarter pound can, 9¾ ounces, avoirdupois.

And so on. The Bill was referred to a committee of this House composed of members of both political parties—the Select Standing Committee on Marine and Fisheries. That committee met, and, after considering the Bill, did not think this provision went far enough. Instead of providing that a one-pound can of lobster should contain 13 ounces of lobster meat, they amended the Bill and provided that a one-pound can should contain 16 ounces of lobster meat and cans of other weights in proportion. My hon. friend will therefore see that it was the action of a select standing committee of this House that imposed—if it can be said to have imposed—a more onerous burden on those who are the canners of lobsters. The Bill as it came from the department, and as it was introduced by me to the House, provided for the quantity of canned meat which had always been contained in a pound can, but the committee thought that when a man buys a pound can of lobster he ought to buy 16 ounces. Therefore the committee amended the Bill, it came before the House and was passed as amended. The Bill then went to the Senate, where, as my hon. friend says, there were a number of gentlemen who are very familiar with the whole lobster business, and it was considered very thoroughly in the Senate. The amendment the Senate made was to reduce the quantity of dry lobster meat that a pound can should contain from 16 ounces to 14 ounces, not to 13 ounces as was provided by the Bill as I introduced it to the House. The Bill comes back from the Senate with the provision that a pound can of lobster shall contain 14 ounces of dry lobster meat and other cans in similar proportion. The reason given for this amendment to the Senate was that it would be a hardship to require 16 ounces of dry meat, because a pound of lobster meat requires 2 ounces of liquid to give it the proper quality and flavour. If 16 ounces of dry meat were required the cans would have to be enlarged, necessitating changes in the can making and stamping machines, in the size of the tin plates and in the cutting dies. These points were all considered by the committee, and it was believed that as the Act would not become operative until December, 1918, there would be ample time to ascertain if the increased quantity of meat required to be put in a can would cause a hardship to the industry. The Senate, after thoroughly considering the matter, came to the conclusion that 14 ounces, not 13 ounces, should be contained in a pound can, for the reason that a pound can of dry lobster requires 2 ounces of liquid in order to give it the proper quality and flavour. That amendment is quite acceptable to the department and the Government. That is the only change, with this exception: There has been a can put up from time to time which is known as a picnic can. That picnic can contains 10 ounces. The Senate struck that out. They said that in view of the fact that their changes provide a can of 9½ ounces, it is unnecessary to continue the picnic can of 10 ounces, because there is only half an ounce difference between the two, and to have one can of 9½ ounces and another of 10 would lead to confusion. I think there is something in that view of the case, and there is no reason why the picnic can should not be cut out. These are the only changes made by the Senate, and they are amendments which we are quite willing to accept.

Mr. LOGGIE: I happen to be a member of the committee to which this Bill was referred but unfortunately I was absent when it was under discussion. I certainly would not have given my assent to the report of the committee as it came before the House, nor to the Bill as it passed the House and went to the Senate. As to the contents of tins, whether they should be 16 ounces of dry meat, or 13, or 14, or 15

ounces, that is a matter of opinion. It has not been the practice to put 16 ounces of dry meat in a pound can of lobster for a good many years. Dry lobsters are not considered as acceptable to the trade as those that have a little juice in the can when it is opened. It has been the practice for many years by most packers to put 15 ounces of meat in a pound can and one ounce of pickle; then when the can is opened it contains 15 ounces of meat and one ounce of juice, and so in proportion with the half pound, the quarter pound and the three-quarter pound tins. It is important that there should be uniformity, and I think there is a movement in another department to have the net weight put on all tinned goods. That is the law in the United States. For instance, a tin of fruit known as a No. 2 tin, commonly called a 2-pound tin, contains actually only about 20 ounces, and under the American law the net weight must be put on all labels. The minister is in error in saying that the picnic can and the three-quarter pound can are the same. The picnic can is a tall can about two and one-half inches in diameter and nearly four inches high. The three-quarter pound can that he refers to is a flat can.

Mr. HAZEN: I did not say that the three-quarter pound can and the picnic can were the same. I said that the picnic can in the Bill we introduced contained 10 ounces, but that as the Senate reduced the weight so that one can will now contain 10½ ounces, they did not consider it desirable to continue the picnic can with 10 ounces.

Mr. LOGGIE: The three-quarter pound can is not the same shape as the picnic can and it is desirable to retain the picnic as there is a demand for lobsters put up in that shape; it is a can which contains 9¼ ounces of solid meat and ¾ of an ounce of juice. There is a difference of one and one-half ounces between it and the three-quarter pound can.

Mr. HAZEN: Under the Senate amendments a one-pound can will contain 14 ounces, and the three-quarter pound 10½ ounces. The picnic can contains 10 ounces.

Mr. LOGGIE: But that 10 ounces is on the basis of 16 ounces to the pound. The real net weight for a picnic can should be 9 ounces or 9¼ ounces, so that I am quite right when I say that there is a difference of one and one-half ounces between the picnic and the three-quarter pound can.

Mr. HAZEN: The Senate struck out the picnic can altogether.

Mr. LOGGIE: I am trying to show that it is a different size from the others and that it should not be abolished. I do not see why it should not be replaced in the Bill.

Mr. SINCLAIR: The Senate is opposed to picnics.

Mr. LOGGIE: There is a demand for this package in some parts of the United States and in the Maritime Provinces as well. I do not see any serious objection to the change in the weights. Is any provision made for the exportation of canned lobsters with no label on them? The minister knows that there are dealers in France who use their own labels, and the trade would be handicapped if we were forced to put labels on the cans.

Mr. HAZEN: There is no change in the law in that respect. That refers to lobsters and salmon.

Mr. SINCLAIR: Does not the Bill provide that all cans should be labelled?

Mr. HAZEN: There is a provision that the minister may exempt cans intended for export.

Mr. SPEAKER: I must remind hon. members that the House is not in committee; that one speech only is permitted to each hon. member, and that the motion before the Chair is that the House do agree to the amendments made to this Bill by the Senate.

Mr. HAZEN: May I say that the only amendments made by the Senate are with regard to the quantity of lobsters to be contained in each tin?

Mr. SINCLAIR: Reverting to the question whether the cans are to be labelled or not, section 12 reads:

12A. (1) All fish and shellfish canneries shall be inspected as provided by the regulations. All fish and shellfish packed in cans shall be subject to inspection during the whole course of preparation and packing and all such cans shall be marked with,—

(a) the initials of the Christian names, the full surname and the address, or, in the case of a firm or corporation, the firm or corporation name and address or the name and address of the packer or of the fish dealer obtaining it direct from the packer;

(b) a true and correct description of the contents of the can, including the vernacular name and the minimum net weight of the fish or shellfish in the can plainly printed in a conspicuous manner, and the name of the place where the same was packed.

Section 12g of the Bill reads:

12G. No person shall offer or accept for export or shall export any fish or shellfish sub-

ject to inspection under this Act, unless the requirements of this Act and of the regulations regarding inspection and marking have been complied with, and every person offering any fish or shellfish for export or exporting the same shall furnish such proof with respect to inspection and marking as is required by the regulations, whether the fish or shellfish so offered for export or exported are subject to inspection or not.

It would seem, from the reading of those two sections together, that all packed lobsters must be marked with the name of the packer, and a description of the contents, and, unless this is done, it is not lawful to export them. I do not think there can be any doubt that that is the meaning of the regulation, however, I may be wrong.

Mr. HAZEN: Subsection 4 of section 2 gives power to the Governor in Council—

Mr. SPEAKER: The motion before the House is that the House concur in the amendments made by the Senate to this Bill. It is not in order to discuss the Bill generally.

Mr. SINCLAIR: I may be out of order in referring to that matter, but it was brought up by the hon. member for Northumberland, and I thought it would be in order for me to make a few remarks in in reply to him. On the question as to what the quantity in the can shall be, I am not able to give the House any special advice. I regret that I was not present at the time this Bill was introduced. It was considered by a special committee. The minister will see that the trade ought to be notified as to legislation of this kind. I should like to know from the minister, when we come to deal with this question in committee, what notice has been given to the trade. It may be a matter of great interest to them to decide what quantity of fish may be in a can, and, while members of the House may not know much about it, they should put their constituents in touch with what is going on here, and give them an opportunity to be heard from. I have not had the opportunity to communicate with my constituents, I was not aware that these changes were being made with regard to the quantity that was to be placed in a can, and I should like to know from the minister, when we go into committee, what steps have been taken to acquaint the trade with the contents of this Bill. I have no objection to the Bill, but I think it would be perhaps easier to deal with it if the House were moved into committee, and we were allowed to discuss the question, in order to obtain the information we require.

Motion agreed to and amendments made by the Senate concurred in.

SUPPLY.

House in Committee of Supply, Mr. Rainville in the Chair.

Department of Railways and Canals—To provide for increase in salary of Departmental Solicitor to $4,500, $500; to provide for increase in salary of Assistant Chief Engineer in First Division, Subdivision A, to $4,000, $500; to provide for promotion of G. W. Yates to First Division, Subdivision A, at $3,000, $200; to provide for promotion of E. R. Williams to Second Division, Subdivision A, $550; to provide for promotions from Subdivision A of the Third Division to Subdivision B of the Second Division to the following: B. C. Waddell $200, W. T. O'Regan $200, C. P. Buckley $100, J. W. Weir $100, F. W. Addy $100, C. E. Bleakney $100, $800—$2,550.

Mr. MACDONALD: Who is the departmental solicitor?

Mr. COCHRANE: Mr. Fairweather.

Mr. SINCLAIR: What salary is he getting now?

Mr. COCHRANE: $4,000. He is an extra good man, and I am afraid I would not be able to keep him unless I raised his salary. Of course the Railway Department is under a different system from most of the other departments. It did not come under the Civil Service Act originally.

Mr. CARVELL: So far as this particular item is concerned I have no objection. I quite agree that this officer is more than an ordinarily good man, and I doubt if the minister would be able to obtain the services of an equally efficient man for any less money. I know nothing about the other items, except that the salaries which civil servants in Ottawa are receiving are so tremendously large, compared with the amount ordinary people outside of Ottawa are receiving in the way of salaries, that when we commence to make a comparison we are rather surprised. However I realize, so far as the position of chief solicitor of a department is concerned, that you require a big enough man to command a salary anywhere, and I believe you have that man in Mr. Fairweather.

Mr. COCHRANE: I may say the same with reference to Mr. Sherwood, Assistant Chief Engineer. He is an exceptionally bright man, who, I am satisfied, could command more than the salary he is receiving, if he went outside. Then I am increasing the salary of my secretary to an amount

equal to the salaries of most of the secretaries in the service.

I would not trade him for any of them. Mr. Williams entered the service in 1912, but he is on a very low salary now, and he has proved an exceptionally fine man. In my private business I acted on the principle of not being afraid to pay a good man what he was worth, and I believe in the same system in the department, because it is the only way to secure efficiency and good work. Most of these employees were in the department when I took charge, so that it is not a matter of politics in any shape or form that I am asking for these increases.

Mr. SINCLAIR: Was Mr. Williams appointed under the Civil Service Act?

Mr. COCHRANE: Yes.

Mr. CARVELL: So far as Mr. Sherwood is concerned, I fully concur in what the minister states. I am inclined to agree with the minister that, if he has in his employment a good man, he should pay him as he would do in the ordinary business affairs of life. As I said before, the salaries at Ottawa are so much greater than they are in the rest of Canada that people are compelled to scrutinize them with perhaps a little more care than they would otherwise do.

Mr. COCHRANE: The salaries are not properly equalized.

Mr. CARVELL: If the minister would, as he says, equalize them, and would give proper salaries to the men who are doing the real work, that would be much better. We all know that in every department the real work is done by a very small number of expert officials.

Mr. COCHRANE: That is true.

Mr. CARVELL: Such men should receive salaries commensurate with their work and the importance of it. I recognize, of course, that with such an institution as the Civil Service, you have to take men at an average and put them in a class.

Mr. MACDONALD: Are these items providing for the promotion of different officials in accordance with the Civil Service Act or contrary to it? When you promote a man from one division to a higher division, should he not first pass an examination under the Civil Service Act?

Mr. COCHRANE: Mr. Williams, who was appointed in 1912, is now over age. He is capable of passing the examination; in fact, he coaches others for it. He is an exceptionally fine man, a man with a family, and, I think, very deserving.

Mr. CARVELL: Probably I have met the official, but I do not know him by sight. What is his occupation?

Mr. COCHRANE: He is Mr. Bell's secretary, and works in the comptroller's office.

Mr. CARVELL: I know now who he is.

Mr. SINCLAIR: How are these appointments made when the parties are over age?

Mr. COCHRANE: Mr. Williams was not over age when he was first appointed, but he is over age now. He was appointed under the Civil Service Act after passing the examination, but he is too old now to take the examination for promotion.

Mr. CARVELL: I feel that the Civil Service Act should be adhered to, especially in regard to appointments, but I agree with the view held by the minister, 5 p.m. that when you have a man who is rendering valuable services, I would not hesitate very much over the Civil Service Act in order to pay him the salary to which he is entitled. Of course, once you open the door to those promotions, it is pretty hard to know when to stop.

Mr. SINCLAIR: A good many appointments have been made under section 21 of the Civil Service Act. During the present session a return was brought down showing that no less than 74 appointments had been made by this Administration under section 21. I do not think, however, the Railway Department had any of them.

Mr. COCHRANE: Promotions cannot be made under that section.

Mr. SINCLAIR: A large number of appointments were made under that section which permits the appointment of men as experts. It appeared from the return that many of those who were called experts were, as a matter of fact, not experts at all.

Railways and canals—chargeable to capital —Canadian Government railways—to provide for building of two wooden ships, $600,000.

Mr. MACDONALD: Where are those ships to be built?

Mr. COCHRANE: A contract was let in Vancouver, and the parties were to put up a bond of $50,000, but they could not do it. In fact, they would not go on with the work at any price on account of the increase in the cost of materials, wages, etc. The hon. member for St. John (Mr. Pugsley) asked me to lay the contracts on the Table, and I did so on Monday.

Mr. PUGSLEY: The minister will remember that some days ago when this matter was up, he assured me he would call for tenders so as to give builders in eastern Canada as well as builders in western Canada an opportunity of tendering.

Mr. COCHRANE: Yes.

Mr. PUGSLEY: When were those contracts entered into?

Mr. COCHRANE: One in March and one in June of this year. The copies of the contracts have been laid on the Table.

Mr. PUGSLEY: When were the contractors released from their obligations?

Mr. COCHRANE: In August.

Mr. PUGSLEY: Just a few weeks ago?

Mr. COCHRANE: Yes.

Mr. MACDONALD: What are these boats to be used for? Are they to be employed in connection with the Intercolonial railway or on what service are they to be used?

Mr. COCHRANE: They were to be employed on a route from Vancouver and Victoria through the Panama canal to St. John and Halifax and also to the West Indies.

Mr. MACDONALD: Are they to be used in connection with the government railways?

Mr. COCHRANE: Yes.

Mr. MACDONALD: That is a pretty far off connection. The minister's jurisdiction in regard to the government railways extends only from Winnipeg to the Maritime Provinces. I do not see what purpose there could be in the Railway Department operating ships.

Mr. COCHRANE: They will not only take freight that the Intercolonial brings to Halifax and St. John, but bring freight from the West and deliver it to those ports. I hope the day will soon come when we shall have ships to run in connection with the government railways across the Atlantic to Liverpool and London.

Mr. MACDONALD: That is a pious wish that hon. gentlemen opposite declared a few years ago was impossible of fulfillment because of the alleged impossibility of constructing ships in Canada. We were told that was a dream that could be realized only after fifty years. I am glad the minister is coming to the view that it is possible a few years hence for ships to be constructed in Canada which will be able to carry on our transportation business.

[Mr. Cochrane.]

Mr. COCHRANE: I do not think I made a statement like that.

Mr. MACDONALD: No, the minister did not, but a good many other hon. gentlemen opposite did, including the minister who sits next to him (Sir George Foster) and the Prime Minister.

Sir GEORGE FOSTER: My hon. friend is quite hazy in his ideas.

Mr. MACDONALD: The committee ought to consider the question of the construction of ships for the purpose of supplying the wastage that is going on due to the destruction of vessels by submarines. This is one of the most important problems that can engage the attention of the House and the Government. Hon. members from the Maritime Provinces may probably understand better than hon. gentlemen who come from the central parts of Canada the unfortunate position in which Canada is as regards the transportation of our products across the ocean as a result of the lack of ships.

Day after day, week after week, during the last few months, ever since the submarine campaign commenced, ships of a tonnage of 1,600 and upwards have been sunk at the rate of from 18 to 40 a week. Millions of tons of shipping have been destroyed. Notwithstanding these facts, we in Canada are doing practically nothing with a view to making up that wastage. It is true that the Minister of Finance advanced to the Imperial Munitions Board $10,000,000 as part payment on account of money that is owing by Canada to the British Governnment. That $10,000,000 is being appropriated by the Imperial Munitions Board for the construction of ships of a certain type. Here and there steel ships are being constructed; the industry is being successfully carried on in British Columbia. But when we bring up the matter of the construction of steel ships in eastern Canada, we are told that it is very difficult to get steel plates. The very fact that we cannot get steel plates for the construction of these vessels is evidence of that lack of organization that has characterized all the operations of the Government in connection with the war. Why is it that steel plates can be obtained for the construction of steel ships at Vancouver by the Imperial Munitions Board, but cannot be obtained for the construction of ships in eastern Canada? As to the building of wooden ships, with all due justice to the Imperial Munitions Board, the plans which they submitted to the people engaged in the wooden ship-

building industry in eastern Canada involved the introduction into the ships of certain non-essential things which were purely British in their character. These things are very difficult for our shipbuilders to obtain; consequently it is most difficult to live up to the specifications. In the old days more wooden ships were constructed in this country than were constructed in Great Britain, and I do not see why there should not be a reasonable departure from these specifications, which are peculiar in their character. Again, people engaged in the construction of mercantile ships in Canada get contracts from the Imperial Munitions Board for the construction of ships, according to their specifications, upon force account. In the county of Lunenburg wooden ships have been constructed for a great many years. Not long ago a complaint came from that district to the effect that under the Imperial Munitions Board contract for the construction of a ship in the town of Liverpool, all kinds of inducements were being offered in the way of wages and otherwise to attract men from the other shipbuilding industry into the works which were being carried on for the Imperial Munitions Board under force account. That ought not to be. There should be some organization on the part of this Government with a view to improving and extending the shipbuilding industry. When hon. gentlemen on this side suggest that the Government take some action in the matter, we are told that the Imperial Munitions Board are the people that we have to deal with. That may be technically correct, but why should the whole question of the construction of ships in Canada be committed into the hands of a body responsible entirely to the Imperial authorities? My hon. friend now proposes to build two ships. Why should not the Government devise some general policy of aid to the construction of ships at this time? When Mr. Balfour went to the United States, he was accompanied by a group of experts who held consultation with the proper official in the United States. These experts did not come to Canada. They had conferences with the United States Government; they laid down the lines upon which the United States could assist the Allies. They settled upon the number of men to be sent by the United States, the number of shells to be provided, the quantity of food to be sent forward, the number of ships to be constructed by the United States in order to make up in some degree the wastage on the sea. The same thing may be said about the delegations from France and Italy to the United States. But none of these gentlemen came to Canada, except Mr. Balfour and Mr. Viviani, who spent a pleasant hour or so with us before their return to their respective countries. Time after time the member for St. John (Mr. Pugsley) and I have, in this House, urged upon the Government the necessity for action in this matter. We were told that some very mysterious arrangements had been made by which the Imperial Government was to act through the Munitions Board. All that has been done, however, has been the advance by the Minister of Finance of $10,000,000 in part payment of the debt that Canada owes Great Britain. Nothing has been done to assist the construction of ships in this country, with the exception of this small item in the estimates. There should be development of private enterprise under Government supervision; Government aid should be given along proper lines. The shell industry of Canada has been cut off; thousands of men are being dismissed from their employment. The men who invested their money in the making of shells are losing their investments; the men who have been employed in that work are being deprived of any means of earning their living.

There comes from every part of this country a demand that assistance should be given in the matter of shipbuilding. The transportation of food supplies to the other side is a matter of very serious importance. Then there is the problem of transporting across the ocean the unlimited quantities of fish that are to be found on the maritime coasts, and around Newfoundland. The apple crop of the Maritime Provinces, which is one of the best in years, cannot be sent across because of the lack of ships. The lumber trade of Canada is paralyzed because nothing has been done in the way of providing the necessary transportation. If you leave out of consideration the ships engaged in the transportation of men and of a small quantity of shells, you realize that there is an entire disappearance from the seas of Canadian merchant shipping. Is the Government going to do nothing to remedy this condition? Is the building of ships to be left entirely to Great Britain? Are the ships to be built by the Munitions Board in Canada to be the property of Great Britain? Are we to own no merchant marine in Canada? Why have we not done as the United States has done? Why has there not been an organization for the pur-

pose of supplying the defects in our merchant shipping? These are problems of which the Government has not offered any solution. The Minister of Trade and Commerce, whose attention was directed to these matters some months ago, failed to appreciate the importance of the subject. Does he seriously think that the people will accept as the performance of the whole duty of the Government the payment of a certain amount of money to the Imperial Munitions Board?

What about the wage earners of this country, particularly those engaged in the steel industry? Where are they to get employment? Where are the ships to be found? Are we to sit here supinely watching the hundreds and thousands of tons of shipping go down day by day and, while every other nation interested in the war and in the maintenance of transportation is doing its duty, are we to be told that our Government is incapable of dealing with this problem in any way, and that the only solution that can be found is the suggestion that we are going to have those two ships costing $600,000? If this Government is doing anything else, I am sure the House and the country would like to know what it is. I submit this beggarly proposition of $600,000 to help towards the establishment of a merchant marine in Canada, with thousands of tons of shipping going down day by day, and our trade being paralyzed, and our shell manufacturing being absolutely stopped, is all the Government proposes to do in the way of meeting the existing conditions.

Mr. PUGSLEY: I agree fully with the remarks just made by my hon. friend from Pictou (Mr. Macdonald). I have had it brought home to me perhaps as strongly as to any member of this House how lamentably the Government has failed in the proper discharge of its duty towards Canada and towards the Empire in the matter of shipbuilding. As my hon. friend has said the subject has been brought before the House on a great many occasions. We have urged it upon the Minister of Trade and Commerce (Sir George Foster) who seems to have been entrusted more particularly with this matter, and who from the experience we have had with that hon. gentleman, so far as shipbuilding is concerned, must have been entrusted with it because to the knowledge of his colleagues he would not take any action along practical lines. The minister has told us that he had in view an elaborate scheme for the building of ships after the war. He did not seem to appreciate the fact that it is during the war and under the extraordinary conditions caused by the war that the Government should take action in the direction of shipbuilding. After the war, these questions will solve themselves very well. Since the outbreak of the war, the condition so far as transportation is concerned, not only across the Atlantic but along the coasts of Canada, has become more acute from year to year and from month to month. At the present time, we in the Maritime Provinces are in the deplorable condition that we—with thousands of miles of coast-line and great forests capable of supplying all the timber necessary for the building of ships, and with splendid sites for shipyards, and with our men having the instinct for shipbuilding—see our shipping practically disappeared from the seas, and even the coasting trade of Canada not being supplied with ships. There are no vessels capable of carrying on that trade, and the people of the Maritime Provinces are in the position that they are obliged to pay three times as much for coal as they did a few years ago. This is a deplorable condition of affairs, but it does not seem to appeal to the Government. After the third year of the war, they appointed a fuel controller. What is this fuel controller doing? He is simply telling the people that the price of coal is high because there are no ships to carry the coal from the points of production to the Maritime Provinces. Yet the Minister of Trade and Commerce, who has been charged with this work, sits back supinely and says: Those are dreadful conditions, but they must go on, there seems to be no remedy for them. I think the Government ought to give some answer to the charge which has been laid by my hon. friend from Pictou.

Mr. COCHRANE: The election is not on yet. This is not the time to make campaign speeches.

Mr. PUGSLEY: I am not making a campaign speech. I am speaking for my constituency and my provinces, and I am speaking for the Maritime Provinces. I am endeavouring to depict as well as I can the unbearable conditions existing there because of the supineness, the indifference, the apathy, and the inaction of the Government in connection with shipbuilding. My hon. friend has pointed to the fact that the Imperial Munitions Board is building ships in Canada. It is quite true they are doing a little in that direction, but it is only

very little. There are hundreds of shipyards in Canada where formerly wooden vessels were built, which are idle at the present time, and which this Government could easily utilize for the purpose of building ships. Surely this subject is of sufficient importance to excite the Government to action, once it is brought to their attention. However, the Government does not seem to pay any attention to it. My hon. friend the Minister of Railways (Mr. Cochrane) says it is too early to speak of these things because the election is not on. If he will pardon me for saying it, we have had a very strong bit of evidence to-day that the election is to be on soon, because we have seen in the legislation brought down that the Government is in a state of desperation to win the election by any means, fair or foul. When we see this, we must see that the election is to come on soon. The words I have uttered have not been influenced at all by any feeling I have in regard to the election, because I can assure my hon. friend that I am quite prepared to meet my electors at any time the Government chooses to bring on the election.

Mr. W. H. BENNETT: Did I understand my hon. friend to say that the price of coal in Canada to-day is three times what it was before the war?

Mr. PUGSLEY: About three times.

Mr. W. H. BENNETT: In the province of Ontario?

Mr. PUGSLEY: I am speaking of the Maritime Provinces.

Mr. W. H. BENNETT: You are entirely wrong as to Ontario.

Mr. PUGSLEY: The price of hard coal in Ontario is only two-thirds of what it is in the Maritime Provinces, although we have water connection between the Maritime Provinces and the points of production. The enormous price anthracite coal is bringing in the Maritime Provinces is caused by the lack of transportation facilities. That is what we complain of. When this war broke out, the Government should have known that the British authorities would commandeer all the shipping it could, because the British Government would need all the ships it could obtain. The Government of Canada should have known that the demand for transportation would therefore increase, whereas the ships would necessarily decrease. It is because of the high cost of transportation by water that coal costs 33⅓ per cent more in the Maritime Provinces than it does in Ontario, strange as it may seem to my hon. friend from Simcoe (Mr. W. H. Bennett). Coal costs less than $10 per ton in Ottawa, whereas, in the city of St. John, it costs $15 and upwards per ton. We have been three years in the war, and I make the assertion that this Government has done absolutely nothing with a view to assisting the transportation by water. It has done nothing to assist in maintaining the coasting trade of the country, and it has done nothing to assist in the transportation of our produce across the Atlantic. The fact that the Munitions Board has done something is no excuse for this Government for their entire want of action in reference to this most important question.

With regard to these two vessels which were to be built for the purpose of assisting trade by the two oceans between eastern and western Canada, why has no action been taken? I remember that the Minister of Customs (Mr. Reid), a year or more ago, made the statement publicly—I am not quite sure but that he made it in Vancouver—that this great forward step was to be taken so as to cheapen, if possible, transportation between eastern and western Canada. What has the Minister of Railways and Canals done? Without getting any vote from Parliament, he went through the farce of letting a contract, without public tender, to firms in British Columbia for the building of two wooden vessels. He took no security, he required no deposit, but without parliamentary authority he bound this Government to pay these contractors for the building of two ships. They, apparently, were not bound at all. They put up no security, but they signed a contract—

Mr. COCHRANE: —which calls for security.

Mr. PUGSLEY: Yes, if they did not give security the contract would be of no force or effect. These gentlemen waited for a considerable time and they found they could do better by getting contracts for building ships for the Imperial Munitions Board. They asked the minister to release them from the contract and their yards were taken over for the purpose of building vessels for the Imperial Munitions Board at actual cost, plus 10 or 15 per cent. That is all the minister has done towards building ships. He comes to-day asking for an appropriation of 20 or 30 per cent more than was the contract price of the vessels

under the arrangement which he had entered into with these builders in Vancouver. This is the sorry result of the boastful words of the Minister of Customs, uttered publicly, for the encouragement of the people of Vancouver upwards of a year ago. However, I am glad that the minister is going to call for tenders from builders in eastern Canada as well as in western Canada. I know there are plenty of people in eastern Canada who would be delighted if they were afforded an opportunity of engaging in the building of wooden ships. But the fact that the minister proposes to take this step now is no excuse for the inaction of this Government during three whole years of war.

Mr. SINCLAIR: What are the dimensions and tonnage of these ships?

Mr. COCHRANE: 2,500 tons.

Mr. PUGSLEY: I notice they are to be 250 feet in length.

Mr. KYTE: I would like to say a word to my hon. friend the Minister of Railways about the desirability of encouraging shipbuilding in Nova Scotia. At the last session of the provincial legislature a commission was appointed for the purpose of looking into this whole question, and it will be in a position in a short time to report upon the most desirable location for a shipbuilding plant in that province. We have a very large and important iron and steel industry in Sydney with unlimited quantities of coal in the immediate vicinity. I am quite sure that if the Government would give the assistance to shipbuilding enterprise in Nova Scotia that it has given in British Columbia, something very substantial would result in the way of establishing that important industry in the province. It transpired a few evenings ago, when the estimates for dredging in British Columbia were under consideration by the Committee of Supply, that they are building ships in British Columbia some four miles up the Fraser river, and a grant of $100,000 was asked to dredge the channel, as I understand it, to enable them to get their ships floated to the ocean when they are constructed. No such handicap would obtain with respect to the location of a shipbuilding plant in Nova Scotia. At Sydney we have one of the very best harbours in the world and all the material necessary at hand to enter upon the construction of ships.

Mr. COCHRANE: Do you mean to say that you manufacture the steel to build ships?

[Mr. Pugsley.]

Mr. KYTE: I have no doubt that those who are interested in the manufacture of steel would very readily undertake the construction of steel ships if the minister would give the same encouragement to the industry in Nova Scotia as is given in British Columbia. I understand the Munitions Board is furnishing the full amount of the cost of building these ships in British Columbia plus 15 per cent profit. I do not know that there would be very much difficulty in inducing the Dominion Iron and Steel Company to undertake the construction of ships in Sydney under the same conditions?

Mr. SINCLAIR: I do not think this is any solution of the shipbuilding problem. I am sorry to see the minister embarking upon the policy of the building and ownership of wooden ships. The Government should go into the building of steel ships and not wooden ships. If private individuals wish to undertake the building of wooden ships, there should be every encouragement given to them, but it is a very backward step for the Dominion Government to undertake the building, ownership and sailing of wooden ships. The Government, a few months ago, with a great flourish, passed an Order in Council in which they made provision to give certain aid towards the construction of ships. But they provided that this aid would not apply to any ship of less than 500 tons. There is a class of wooden vessels built in Nova Scotia that is found very useful in the local trade, especially with the West Indies. These vessels are nearly all less than 500 tons. Most of them are between 200 and 400 tons. The provision which allows a rebate to vessels of over 500 tons does not apply to the class of ships that are being built in the Maritime Provinces. The provision is that the builders will receive back ninety-nine per cent of the duty paid on imported material going into construction of these vessels. It would be a very good step in the way of encouraging shipbuilding in the Maritime Provinces if it applied to the class of ships to which I refer.

Mr. COCHRANE: Do they build these ships of steel?

Mr. SINCLAIR: No, most of them are wooden vessels and they are used chiefly in the West Indian trade and trade to the River Plate and to South American ports. They are a very useful class of vessels and most of the coal that is used in the Maritime Provinces is carried from ports in the

United States to the Maritime Provinces in these ships. Lumber exported to the United States is carried in this class of vessel. It is important we should promote the building of these vessels. It was a disappointment, especially to the people of the Maritime Provinces, when the Government fixed the tonnage limit at 500 tons because the vessels that I speak of are nearly all under that tonnage.

A score of articles that go into the construction of these wooden ships, sails, gear, rope, wire and so on, are imported under a very heavy duty. If the Government would refund 99 per cent of the duty paid in regard to ships from 200 tons up, they would be doing a great thing for the trade. I hope this matter will not be overlooked. I do not expect that very much will come from the construction of two wooden vessels. The minister has been very meagre in the information he has given us. We have learned that the ships are to be about 2,500 tons, and that, so far as I know, is the only fact he has told us in regard to them. It would be interesting to the committee and to the public to know what kind of ships the minister intends to build.

Mr. COCHRANE: The contracts were laid on the Table; you could find out yourself.

Mr. SINCLAIR: Yes, but laying the contract on the Table and not placing the information on Hansard or giving it to the press does not give much information to the public. This is a new departure, it is the first time that the Government of Canada has entered upon commercial shipbuilding and the public should be informed of the minister's plans. Does he intend to build a fleet of ships, and where will they ply? We got one item of information, that they are expected to run between some port in British Columbia and eastern Canadian ports, via the Panama canal. In that case they will come in competition with his own railway. Are the people of Canada going to embark on the construction, ownership and operation of cargo steamers?

Mr. COCHRANE: I have said that it is intended to build two ships of so many tons, and where they are to run.

Mr. SINCLAIR: What is the length of the ships?

Mr. COCHRANE: 250 feet.

Mr. SINCLAIR: What is the beam to be?

Mr. COCHRANE: 45 feet.

Mr. SINCLAIR: What will the speed be?

Mr. COCHRANE: Ten knots.

Mr. MACDONALD: Sailing or steam?

Mr. COCHRANE: Both.

Mr. PUGSLEY: Is my hon. friend (Mr. Sinclair) waiting for more information? If so I am sure he will wait a considerable time, because the Minister of Railways has such confidence in his own judgment that he thinks all the rest of us ought to act upon that judgment without getting any information. The minister may be wise in that course when he cannot give any very satisfactory explanation. The minister said something about not being able to get steel in Canada. I had an interesting piece of information last night which I shall pass on to him. I met the President of the Port Arthur Dry Dock and Shipbuilding company who told me that his company is actively engaged in building ships at Port Arthur and employs about 1200 men. Those are steel ships. They have built the largest freighter which plys upon the Great Lakes, the Morden, a magnificent ship. This shows what can be done. It was a great pleasure to me to hear that, because it was my good fortune when I was minister to enter into a contract for the establishment of a dry dock and ship repairing plant at Port Arthur which resulted in the creation of a ship building plant as well, and it is very gratifying that the company has been able to do such splendid work since. So also with another company which the Liberal Government was the means of inducing to establish a ship building plant in Canada, the Vickers-Maxim Company of Montreal. They have been doing very satisfactory work in ship building during the last three or four years. I have no doubt that, had proper encouragement been given, quite a large number of steel ships would have been turned out in Canada before this. I am sorry that the Minister of Marine (Mr. Hazen) is not in his place, because I should like to take this opportunity of reminding him—and in his absence I shall remind the Government—of the splendid opportunity which was missed by Canada when this Government reversed the policy of the late Government and determined not to engage in the building of a Canadian navy in Canada.

I would remind the Minister of Marine that when he came into power he found in his office a tender from a firm, who were the lowest tenders for the work, engaging to build some ten war vessels, cruisers and destroyers, for the Government of Can-

ada. They had plans for the building and equipping of a great ship yard with all the requisite plant, and if the contract had been let to them, there is no doubt that they could have followed the example, perhaps upon a larger scale, of the Vickers-Maxim people and also the Port Arthur Dry Dock and Ship Building Company. But, unfortunately, the Government determined that they would not build ships in Canada. The Prime Minister (Sir Robert Borden) read in this House, as a reason why they should not engage in shipbuilding in Canada, a report from that distinguished gentleman who was for a time First Lord of the Admiralty in Great Britain, in which it was stated that large ships could not be built in Canada because they required a very firm foundation on which to rest, and also because it would be necessary to have cranes which could lift 150 tons. Those were apparently two insuperable obstacles to the building of ships in Canada. It seems to me too bad that the Government became impressed with the idea that for those reasons, and I suppose there must have been some others, it was impracticable to engage in the building of ships on a large scale in Canada. What a splendid thing it would have been if we had had these shipyards established for the building of war vessels! It would have proved of enormous advantage in the present war, and it would have led necessarily to the building of a large number of commercial vessels as well.

We have lost five or six years in our national life along most important lines, but let me again express the hope that the Government will have the courage, in the face of their refusal in the past to do anything, to enter upon a vigorous policy, even at this late date. A great many of us are afraid the war will continue a considerable time longer, and the critical conditions which are existing to-day, so far as ocean tonnage and the tonnage requisite for our coasting trade are concerned, are becoming more acute, and will become more acute as the months go by. I hope the words which have been uttered to-day will not fall upon absolutely deaf ears, but that some really practical steps will be taken in order to relieve the present situation.

Mr. MACDONALD: May I ask the Minister of Trade and Commerce what is the policy of the Government with regard to assistance to shipbuilding in Canada?

Mr. PUGSLEY: The Government is hard of hearing.

[Mr. Pugsley.]

Sir GEORGE FOSTER: I am glad that at the long last we have had the old story—whether this is the swan song or not I am not quite prepared to say—which has been retailed, I suppose, more than a score of times by the hon. gentleman from St. John, ably assisted by the hon. gentleman from Pictou, and which ended to-day with a little different note—a note of modified optimism. Based upon those two vessels, for which the vote is being asked by the Minister of Railways, at last the hon. gentleman thinks he sees signs of the commencement of a more vigorous policy, provided the Government does not again go to sleep on their oars, as he affirms they have done so often, and does not proceed with the construction of the vessels for which this vote has been asked. If either of my hon friends had said anything that they had not repeated a score of times in this House, they would have good grounds for expecting a reply from some member of the Government, but their statements have been answered time and again. We have discussed this matter on lines of policy, and on lines of practical economy, over and over again. All that can be said with reference to this matter at the present time has been said.

Mr. MACDONALD: What has been done?

Sir GEORGE FOSTER: The hon. member for Guysborough rather took issue with my hon. friend from St. John as regards the policy of a vigorous construction of wooden vessels. From his practical experience, he comes to the conclusion that small wooden vessels are not quite the class of vessel that will contribute very much to the commercial marine of this country. They may be good for near-by coasting work, but, as a large shipbuilding policy he thinks the construction of wooden vessels should not be entered upon, but that the construction should be of steel. I think he is absolutely right in that. Economically considered, the day of the small wooden vessels is past. They may do some work along the coast, but, even for extended coasting, the small wooden vesse' has economically passed its time. It is true that at the present moment, any vessel, or any tub that can float and carry something, is bound to find its freight, make its wage in the carriage of freight because of the peculiar conditions. But, as a policy which shall apply, not simply to war times, but to the times that succeed war times, the country which launches into a large system of shipbuilding of com-

paratively small wooden vessels, would, I think, go up against an economic problem which my hon. friend from Guysborough, from his practical experience, would scarcely endorse. The Government has considered the question of the reduction of the minimum tonnage which would be eligible for this 99 per cent rebate on important materials used in the construction of these ships, with a view of encouraging the building of vessels of less than 500 tons. I think the minimum that has been fixed probably goes down as low as any one would consider it profitable to go. But, so far as that is concerned, it will be confined to the schooners plying along our coasts, and I hope the results will be beneficial. The matter has been urged by small ship-builders, and by those who have been engaged in shipbuilding for some time, and their request has been acceded to, and the limit has been brought down to 200 or 100 tons, which is quite as low, I think, as is necessary to go. When you come to the construction of steel vessels of an economical size, as a general thing vessels anywhere between 6,000 and 10,000 tons are supposed to be economic freight carriers for the present. When you come to try to launch a system of state aid, or of shipbuilding aid by the State, or a system entirely carried on by the State, you meet conditions which make it absolutely impossible for Canada at the present time to engage in the business. We must recollect that this war brings other vast charges, and I doubt if many of us in this House to-day understand at all the exact situation which financially impends over this country in its effort to carry the burden of this war, in so far as its own effort is concerned, and the burden of the war across the sea, which, in part, for the time being, is assumed by Great Britain, but for which, of course, we have to pay in the end, and on which we are paying in this war by advancing to Great Britain on this side what she pays for us on the other side.

Mr. MACDONALD: What about the Canadian Northern expenditure?

Sir GEORGE FOSTER: The hon. member for St. John said that all that had been done was to advance to Great Britain some ten million dollars to finance the construction of ships that were being built by the Imperial Munitions Board for the British Admiralty. We are advancing that money, and we are advancing money for very many other things.

Mr. MACDONALD: You are paying the British Government.

Sir GEORGE FOSTER: That is true; we are paying the British Government; we are paying off a debt. We should pay it all off, but it does not make it any the less burdensome for us whether we pay it in that way, or whether we pay it by a draft, and Great Britain sends back the same money to this country to pay for the ships.

The burden is there, and the burden is tremendous. Whilst my hon. friend from Guysborough (Mr. Sinclair) on one occasion in this House, advocated putting $80,000,000 or $100,000,000 or $150,000,000 at work to build ships in this country, that is an easy thing to speak of and to broach, but it is a difficult thing to get the money. But, you say: You find the money for other things.

Mr. PUGSLEY: For the Canadian Northern.

Mr. SINCLAIR: The minister is mistaken; I do not think I advocated anything of the kind.

Sir GEORGE FOSTER: I did the calculating for my hon. friend, if he will recollect the matter. He set the figures and I made the multiplication. He wanted so many vessels built, and I made a calculation as to what it would cost to build those vessels. The cost of the number of vessels he thought we ought to build would have run up between $100,000,000 and $150,000,000. My hon. friend from St. John (Mr. Pugsley) was delighted with his conversation with the Port Arthur shipbuilder. Some vessels were being built at Port Arthur. If he had gone a little deeper into that conversation, he would probably have found difficulties that beset the path of that or any other shipbuilder in this country building steel vessels, and depending, as he must depend, for every steel plate that he put into his vessel, upon United States sources. There is not a plate which has been put into a steel vessel built in Canada which has been rolled in this country. Those plates, if they come into Canada at all, must come from the United States. We cannot, for various reasons, get them from Great Britain.

Mr. PUGSLEY: Does the minister deny what I say, namely, that they are employing 1,200 men at Port Arthur?

Sir GEORGE FOSTER: They may be; I am not saying that they are not. But if they are employing 1,200 men and are building vessels and are using steel from the

United States for that purpose, they are working on contracts which were placed for steel a year or two years ago.

Mr. REID: That work is nearly all in repairing vessels.

Sir GEORGE FOSTER: It is impossible to-day and it has been impossible within the last year to make contracts for the delivery of plates for the building of steel vessels in this country, and to get those contracts filled for months and months and even years. I go further than that and state that, at the present time under the conditions as they exist to-day, it is impossible for men who undertake to build or who contemplate building steel vessels in this country to place a contract in the United States for steel plates for those vessels and get that contract filled.

Mr. MACDONALD: We are engaging in the manufacture of shells in this country and nine-tenths of all the machinery that is used in the manufacture of shells is bought in the United States.

Sir GEORGE FOSTER: There is not the slightest doubt about that. The United States is allowing steel to come into Canada so far as she is under contract for materials of war for the Allies and for Canada, but she is not allowing steel to come into this country for purposes other than for war purposes, that is, for munitions and for the subsidiary processes of making munitions and other war material. That is the condition that exists to-day.

Mr. SINCLAIR: Does the minister say that the United States would not allow steel to come into this country for the construction of ships?

Sir GEORGE FOSTER: The United States to-day, under the steel shipbuilding programme which it is carrying out for itself in connection with the war, and under its obligations towards the Allies and the makers of munitions for the Allies here in Canada as well as elsewhere, is not allowing any steel plates, any steel of certain qualities and grades, to come into this country unless it receives a license upon a requisition certificated by the Department of Trade and Commerce that that steel is for war purposes.

Mr. SINCLAIR: Could not ships be described as being for war purposes?

Sir GEORGE FOSTER: Ships could be described as being for war purposes if they were war ships, but they do not come under the term of "war material" which is allowed to come into Canada under the present embargo placed upon steel by the United States.

Mr. SINCLAIR: Does the minister mean that an ordinary freight vessel to carry goods and munitions across the Atlantic would not be a vessel for war purposes?

Sir GEORGE FOSTER: My hon. friend, by a process of reasoning, can connect almost any industry or enterprise in this country more or less remotely with war industries, but steel for the construction of such vessels is not allowed to come into this country at present. Permits are not being given for steel of that description to come into this country unless it is for war purposes. What steel may come into this country for our basic industries depends entirely upon the demand and supply in the United States for those purposes which I have mentioned. If after those are properly cared for, there is a surplus over and above for processes of manufacture which are not directly connected with the war, then those United States' industries engaged in those processes will be cared for, and, after that, as much as there may be of a surplus may be allowed to be distributed to other countries.

Mr. MACDONALD: Will the minister tell us after eight o'clock what he has done and what he is going to do in regard to shipbuilding?

At six o'clock the Committee took recess.

After Recess.

The Committee resumed at eight o'clock.

Mr. SINCLAIR: The Minister of Trade and Commerce was giving us some information at six o'clock in regard to this item for the building of two wooden ships. I did not understand that he had finished his speech.

Mr. REID: He finished at six.

Mr. SINCLAIR: He stopped at six o'clock without giving us the information for which we were asking. I hope that some of the other ministers will be able to give us that information; otherwise we shall not be able properly to understand this item. I wish to correct the statement made by the minister in reference to certain remarks that I made in this House some weeks ago—I am sorry that he is not in his seat. He said that I made a proposal involving the expen-

diture of the enormous sum of $150,000,000 in the building of ships.

Mr. COCHRANE: He said from $100,000,000 to $150,000,000.

Mr. SINCLAIR: Then I misunderstood him. I never made any such proposal as that. The discussion referred to was with regard to what could be done to overcome the submarine menace. The Germans had embarked upon the sinking of all shipping, and active measures had been taken in the United States to meet the situation. It was proposed in that country—at least this was the statement made in the press—to build 2,000 ships for the purpose of counteracting the destructive work of the Germans. If the Government had taken some steps along the line of what was proposed in the United States, they might have adopted a standard ship and either proceeded to build a number of such vessels or to induce private parties to do so. I think I did mention that it would be possible for Canada to build about one hundred such ships. I did not say whether they should be of wood or of steel—I thought that that was a matter for the Government to decide. The Minister of Railways proposes to build two wooden ships for $600,000. I assume that he is providing for a cost of $300,000 each. According to these figures, if the Minister of Trade and Commerce had accepted my proposal, the cost would have been only $30,000,000, which is a very different figure from $150,000,000. I do not know where the minister got the idea that I made such a proposal as he mentioned.

Mr. REID: When the hon. member was discussing the matter, did he mention the size and tonnage of the vessels proposed to be built?

Mr. SINCLAIR: They were to be vessels of 2,500 tons, of a standard type. If we can build a wooden ship of the class proposed by the minister for $300,000, we could build a steel ship for $450,000. Taking the minister's figures as a basis, therefore, the cost of the vessels proposed in the former discussion, if built of steel, would be only $45,000,000. So that the Minister of Trade and Commerce was away off in his figures when he said that I had suggested the expenditure of such a large sum of money as he mentioned. Since that discussion took place the Government has embarked on some very large ventures. They propose to incur a liability of at least $450,000,000 in connection with the Canadian Northern railway—ten times the liability that would be incurred by the construction of 100 steel vessels. A proposal for the building of ships under such a plan as I have suggested would be much more to the point of winning the war than the proposal to take over the Canadian Northern railway at such enormous cost. In asking for the money to build these two wooden ships, the minister enunciates no policy; the Government simply intends to build two wooden vessels. What they are going to do with them after they build them no one knows. What difference will the building of two wooden ships make in the trade of the Empire or of the world? If the Government do not manage this matter better than they have managed others, this expenditure will be of little benefit to the people of Canada or, indeed, to any one. The minister spoke of running these vessels between ports on the Pacific and ports on the Atlantic, through the Panama canal. What trade does he expect to get on that line, and what return cargoes would he carry from the eastern part of Canada to the Pacific through the Panama canal? I suppose there would be some lumber to carry from British Columbia to Eastern Canada. But I really think that the proposal is not a practicable one. There would be more sense in a proposal to build ships for the purpose of carrying our products to Great Britain. I repeat that this is not a shipbuilding policy, the minister does not say that he is going to build more ships. Then why should we embark on the building of these two wooden ships?

In 1879 the manufacturers of Canada came to Sir John Macdonald and asked for the inauguration of a policy to encourage manufacturing in Canada. Sir John, whether right or wrong, decided that a protective policy was the policy best adapted to build up a manufacturing industry in this country. We all know the history of that development. If, instead of introducing a protective policy on that occasion to enable the manufacturers to build mowing machines, reapers, and other manufactured articles, Sir John A. Macdonald had set up business for himself and decided to build two mowing machines, the Canadian people would have laughed at him. Yet, that is exactly what the Minister of Railways is doing. The people asked the Minister of Railways for a shipping policy, which would enable them to go on with the construction of wooden or steel vessels, and the minister rereplies by calling upon the people to contribute $600,000, saying he is going to build two wooden vessels himself. Yet he calls that a policy.

Mr. COCHRANE: You call it a policy, nobody else did.

Mr. SINCLAIR: What is it?

Mr. COCHRANE: Two ships.

Mr. SINCLAIR: That is some explanation.

Mr. COCHRANE: And no one will benefit more by them than will Nova Scotia.

Mr. SINCLAIR: I doubt it. We require ships in Nova Scotia, but we do not expect the Government to build them for us. If we did, we would be disappointed. Two wooden ships cannot be of very much use in the carrying on of the business of Nova Scotia. If that is all the minister is able to do in the way of assisting the shipbuilding industry, it is a very trifling way of dealing with a big question. The minister, of course, knows that it is possible for the Government to do something in the way of helping the shipbuilding industry. Two proposals have been mentioned in this House. One is that a bounty of so much per ton should be paid by the Government to overcome the excess cost resulting from the high tariff. No country with a high tariff has been successful in establishing a shipbuilding industry. You cannot become a great ship-owning country if you have a high protective tariff. Great Britain is the only country in the world which has made a complete success in shipbuilding. Nearly all the countries in Europe which have protective tariffs have failed to develop this industry. They have assisted shipbuilding, some of them to a very great extent. The United States also offered great help to the industry. They built a protective wall around the country and would not allow one of their citizens to buy a ship outside; every ship sailing under the American flag had to be built in the United States. That was the law up to three years ago. They now have a more intelligent system, and they permit the buying of ships abroad and the registration of those ships under the American flag, without the payment of duty. The second proposal is to reduce the tariff. That is the real cure, and the only way we can ever become a great shipbuilding country. Introduce free trade, and our maritime industry will do the rest. That has been the experience in Great Britain, and for thirty-five years Great Britain has outstripped the world in shipbuilding. Just before the war they had registered tonnage of about 20,000,000 tons, both sail and steam—more than one-half of the total tonnage of the world. It was only possible for England to achieve this result under a free trade policy. Not only was she able to build all the ships required for her own trade, but she built ships for the rest of the world as well. Nearly every foreign nation had its ships built in British yards, because it could be done there cheaper than anywhere else, for the reason that she had free raw material and freedom in every way. The Canadian people should follow the example of the Mother Country. I submit that the people of Canada will not approve of the venture the minister is now making. I see no purpose in going into the building of two wooden ships to be used for the carrying of freight from the Pacific coast to the Atlantic coast via the Panama canal.

Mr. REID: I hardly think it fair that the consideration of an item of this kind should develop into a discussion as to the policy of the Government in regard to building ships. I think that question is large enough to be discussed by itself. To say that the purchase of those two vessels is in any way connected with that policy is, of course, unfair. As I understand the situation it is that the people of British Columbia had been urging for some years that they should have water transportation between eastern Canada and western Canada. They claimed that eastern Canada had the advantage of water transportation. If the provinces of Prince Edward Island, Nova Scotia and New Brunswick were depending solely upon the railways, they would very soon make strong demands for water transportation, because there are many products that will not stand a high freight rate. Those three provinces have water transportation, and they have it at the expense of the Dominion, and British Columbia is paying a part of it. The very constituency my hon. friend (Mr. Sinclair) represents has water transportation at the expense of British Columbia.

Mr. CARROLL: Will the minister kindly point out how the province of Nova Scotia has more water communication than has British Columbia, through the intervention of this Government?

Mr. REID: Does my hon. friend say that the province of Nova Scotia, or any of the lower provinces, have no water communication at the expense of this Government?

Mr. CARROLL: They have. So has British Columbia.

Mr. REID: My hon. friend admits that so far as water transportation is concerned, they have assistance from this Government?

Mr. CARROLL: Yes.

Mr. REID: We agreed on that.

Mr. CARROLL: Were they subsidies?

Mr. REID: They were subsidies.

Mr. SINCLAIR: That means that they were exactly equal. Both of these subsidies were given to ships plying on the coast.

Mr. REID: They get assistance and the people of British Columbia are paying for getting freight from one province to another through expenditures or assistance from the Dominion Government. In British Columbia as I understand it, they have subsidies from one part of the province to another. From Montreal and away down to the lower provinces, they are assisted by subsidies. The people in British Columbia said: We have products that will not stand a heavy freight.

Mr. A. K. MACLEAN: What?

Mr. REID: Lumber and timber, of which they ship in large quantities to eastern Canada. I investigated, and I know that that is so. Millions and millions of feet of timber were shipped to the Toronto harbour works, and they ship large quantities of shingles and lumber. They said: If we could get proper transportation facilities we would have a market that we do not have now in Nova Scotia, New Brunswick, Prince Edward Island and Quebec, for many of these products.

Mr. SINCLAIR: What products does the minister expect to be shipped from eastern Canada to British Columbia?

Mr. REID: The people of British Columbia say that there are manufactured and agricultural products in eastern Canada that they want in British Columbia but which are of such a character that they will not bear heavy freight rates. Then they said: We want to go into shipbuilding, and we want plates and metal products.

Mr. PUGSLEY: The Minister of Trade and Commerce (Sir George Foster) says that we have not got any plates.

Mr. REID: They say in British Columbia: If you will let us get these plates from Nova Scotia, where the iron is made, and nails and bolts from Montreal and other places where they are manufactured in the eastern provinces, at a cheap and reasonable rate, which can only be done by water transportation, we believe that the interchange of products will be advantageous to those parts of the country which are situated so far apart. They also say that the people from Port Arthur to the extreme eastern end of the Dominion have the advantage of water transportation while from Port Arthur west they have no possible way out unless they get water transportaiton through the Panama canal. They wanted a line of steamers between British Columbia and the Atlantic coast. It would also help them they claimed in other ways. There would be, in their opinion, no trouble at all about loading two vessels, one starting at an Atlantic and the other at a Pacific port. They had it in their minds that much more traffic would be offered than these vessels would be able to carry.

Mr. A. K. MACLEAN: They wanted a customs officer at New York, did they not?

Mr. REID: Yes, and the hon. gentleman was in favour of that. The only trouble about that was that we were all anxious to keep the trade within our own territory, while the hon. gentleman wanted it to go through American territory. But I did not agree to that.

Mr. A. K. MACLEAN: I think the shipbuilding programme was favoured by the hon. gentleman as a way by which he could get over the request of the board of trade.

Mr. REID: All right; I will admit that.

Mr. A. K. MACLEAN: Tell us all about it.

Mr. REID: Yes, I will tell you all about it. The British Columbia people, having had no line of steamers, wanted the Government to allow them to ship their freight to New York on American vessels and not to go through Canadian territory at all. They wanted to take back goods manufactured in the United States in order to load the vessels on the return voyage and not get them from the Canadian side. I am free to admit that I was of the opinion, then, as I am now, that we should keep the traffic within ourselves and that if we could get Ontario, Quebec, Nova Scotia, New Brunswick and Prince Edward Island to use British Columbia products. I considered it very good business, and I believe the people

will be satisfied with such an arrangement. The people of British Columbia were satisfied, as far as my observations went, with such a proposal. The people of British Columbia also claimed that there were products that they required at times from the West Indies. We are working up a trade between Canada and the West Indies. These vessels, at some particular time, might possibly not have a full cargo for Halifax or St. John, and they could bring sugar and other products to eastern Canada. On the other hand, they could take a cargo to the West Indies and on to British Columbia and thus help at both ends in building up a trade between western and eastern Canada. That was my idea and my suggestion to my colleagues after I had discussed the matter fully with the British Columbia people.

Now, what was done about these vessels? For the last three or four years it has been almost impossible to get vessels built. To start in and build vessels now would cost three times as much as it would under normal conditions. What I recommended to he Minister of Railways and my colleagues was this: There is a transportation company called the Canada West Transportation Company, in which many of the heads of that large corporation, the Canada Steamship Company are interested. The Canada West Transportation Company gave an order for twelve vessels of exactly the same dimensions as these two vessels that were ordered in British Columbia. I recommended to the Minister of Railways and Canals and my other colleagues that a contract should be awarded for the construction of two vessels on exactly the same lines and on the same terms as those of the Canada West Company. In other words, we said: There is a contract that has been awarded by this company for a dozen vessels, and we will give you a contract on the same terms and at the same price. In that contract the terms were stated, a bond was to be given as to completion, and so on. The British Columbia people were complaining of the freight rates charged by the three great railway companies. They claimed that the freight rates between British Columbia and eastern Canada were almost prohibitive on products of a cheaper kind.

Mr. A. K. MACLEAN: How long were you in British Columbia this time?

Mr. REID: I think I was there eight days. I gave them one answer which I am glad to say is, I believe, coming true. I said to those to whom I was speaking: If you will just have a little patience this Government will do two things; they will give you transportation by vessel between the Atlantic and the Pacific, and they will give you a government-owned and government-operated railway on which they will control the rates, and then you will get justice if you have not received it heretofore.

Mr. A. K. MACLEAN: They will call you a false prophet in a short while.

Mr. REID: Then you cannot have confidence in the Canadian Northern Railway Bill going through. I say it is going through, and when it does my prophecy that we would have a Government-owned and government-operated railway will come true.

Mr. A. K. MACLEAN: By this Government?

Mr. REID: By this Government. It was not with the consent of the hon. member; it was by this Government and by the members sitting on this side, and they are entitled to the credit of the Canadian Northern Railway Bill going through and of the people of Canada having a railway from the Atlantic to the Pacific owned by them.

Mr. CARROLL: But will not the Canadian Northern railway be subject to the jurisdiction of the Railway Commission just the same?

Mr. REID: Certainly.

Mr. CARROLL: They will make the laws regarding the freight rates.

Mr. REID: But the Railway Commission is under the jurisdiction of this Government.

Mr. PUGSLEY: You have always said not.

Mr. REID: The Railway Commission is under this Government, and they will do justice; if they do not we will remedy it.

Mr. PUGSLEY: I thought they were appointed for ten years.

Mr. REID: The people of Canada will in a few days have a railway owned and operated by them—

Mr. PUGSLEY: For which they will pay mighty dearly.

Mr. REID: —in spite of the opposition of the hon. member for St. John, although he was throwing up both hands for it a

few years ago when he believed we would not take it over.

Mr. PUGSLEY: Not at all; you cannot prove that.

Mr. REID: I would not want anything better on which to meet the hon. gentleman on the platform than this very Canadian Northern Railway measure to show the people that we have now a railway that we operate ourselves. However, that is getting away from the item.

Mr. PUGSLEY: That is quite in order.

Mr. REID: No, I am going to ask the Chairman to rule me out of order when I get away from the question.

The CHAIRMAN: Order.

Mr. REID: I believe that in starting with a line of vessels between British Columbia and the Atlantic coast the Government will greatly benefit both the East and the West, and that the people on both coasts will appreciate the start which has been made.

Mr. PUGSLEY: Why were not tenders called for, as this involves an amount over $5,000?

Mr. REID: We asked every shipbuilding yard in British Columbia.

Mr. PUGSLEY: Why not in eastern Canada as well?

Mr. REID: Because there were contracts for a dozen vessels exactly the same awarded by a private company in British Columbia, after every effort had been made to have them built in eastern Canada. I do not believe that these vessels could be got for anything like the same price in the East, because in British Columbia they have the timber while they have not it in the East.

Mr. A. K. MACLEAN: The Minister of Customs chastised the hon. member for Guysborough (Mr. Sinclair) for raising the issue of a shipbuilding policy for Canada, and said that this was not an appropriate time to raise such a question. Perhaps that criticism was fair. On this side of the House we think very highly of the Minister of Railways, and after the criticism by the Minister of Customs of the member for Guysborough I did feel, and I do now feel, that perhaps hon. members on this side were a little unfair to him this afternoon in discussing what is a matter of public policy upon an item to vote moneys for the purchasing of two boats which are not really to be operated as a part of the Intercolonial railway. Perhaps that was why the Minister of Railways was silent. I can understand his silence now. If this vote does not involve the question of the proper national policy for this country in respect of shipbuilding, then the question is, is it a proper thing for the Intercolonial railway to acquire two ships in the operation of the railway? Perhaps it is not that question either, as I think it really has nothing to do with the matter of the operation of the Intercolonial. This policy was inaugurated by the Minister of Customs and was the result of a visit by him to British Columbia. Now he has described his programme at great length—almost three-quarters of an hour—and has informed us very fully as to its origin and its purpose. We are asked to vote $600,000, not for the purpose of determining what our national policy shall be in respect to shipbuilding, not in respect to the Intercolonial, but upon another question altogether, the development of interprovincial trade between the Atlantic coast and the Pacific coast.

Has this vote anything to do with the Intercolonial? If not, it should not be here, and the Minister of Railways should not be asking for this money. If it is for the purpose of the development of interprovincial trade, as the Minister of Customs says, it is a matter of trade and commerce, and must be discussed upon different lines altogether. If this belongs to the Intercolonial, let us inquire whether this is sound policy or not. Why attach this venture to the Intercolonial? The Minister of Customs informs us that it is not to be a part of that railway system. It is not possible to operate these two steamships as a part of that railroad; it is not thinkable that it could be done.

Mr. COCHRANE: Why?

Mr. A. K. MACLEAN: How can you interchange traffic between the Intercolonial railway and these ships, with any degree of certainty?

Mr. REID: How are you going to get the traffic between Ontario and Halifax and St. John in the winter?

Mr. A. K. MACLEAN: By rail.

Mr. REID: Over the Intercolonial.

Mr. A. K. MACLEAN: But the Minister of Customs had these two ships cavorting down to West India waters.

Mr. REID: No, I said Halifax and St. John.

Mr. A. K. MACLEAN: And then going to the West Indies, to load up with sugar.

Mr. REID: That is on the route.

Mr. A. K. MACLEAN: Let me adhere to the question whether these ships should or should not be a part of the Intercolonial railway. I say they should not. The question whether we should or should not encourage interprovincial trade between eastern and western Canada by means of subsidies, or building of boats for that special purpose is another question. I protest against the Intercolonial making an investment of $600,000, with grand opportunities for adding to that investment every month thereafter, to develop trade between eastern Canada and the Pacific coast, where the Intercolonial has no connections whatever. I know the Minister of Railways is too good a business man to believe in his heart that this expenditure is justified upon that ground. I can understand the Intercolonial engaging in the building and operation of ships between Maritime Province ports and British ports. I think the time is near at hand when the Intercolonial must do that, and if they were in the position to purchase fifteen or twenty steamships to-day, of from 5,000 to 10,000 tons capacity, I believe it would be a good policy, and a logical enterprise for the Intercolonial to embark on. The route followed by these steamships would be but a continuation of the Intercolonial system. But, I submit, the operation of two steamboats between the Pacific coast and the Atlantic coast cannot in any sense be construed as a part of the operation of the Intercolonial.

The Minister of Railways justifies this vote on the ground that it is desirable to develop trade between the east and west coasts of Canada. That is a very interesting question. The proposal has merits, there is something to say in favour of it. But do not put it upon the Intercolonial; let it be a matter of national policy. Even if we were attempting to encourage trade between the east and west coasts of Canada, is this the right way to do it? Again I protest against Canada entering into the construction of wooden vessels for this purpose. In the first place, these vessels seem to be very expensive. You are asking us to vote $600,000 for two ships of 2,500 tons each, which would mean a cost of $125 per ton.

[Mr. A. K. Maclean.]

Mr. PUGSLEY: The machinery would cost $110,000.

Mr. A. K. MACLEAN: The total cost completed would be $125 per ton. I know of instances, within twelve months, where ships of a greater tonnage than this, more suitable for this trade, could have been purchased at about $125 per ton. It is true, they were boats engaged in the lake trade in the United States, and some changes would have to be made in them. A great deal of tonnage was available for purchase in the United States within the last eighteen months. During the last three or four years there was, perhaps, not the same amount of tonnage offered. I know that the Dominion Coal Company bought tonnage within fifteen months for about $80 per ton. The vessels were not very large but suited the company. You can enter into contracts to-day, I think, for steel boats for about $125 a ton.

Mr. REID: No.

Mr. CURRIE: Come off.

Mr. A. K. MACLEAN: I do not admit that my hon. friend from North Simcoe (Mr. Currie) is an authority on these matters.

Mr. CURRIE: How many tons of plate and steel is there in a vessel of this size?

Mr. A. K. MACLEAN: I could not tell you.

Mr. CURRIE: About 3,000 tons.

Mr. A. K. MACLEAN: I could not tell you that, but within the last two months contracts have been entered into for the construction of steel ships in the United States for $155 to $160 per ton.

Mr. CURRIE: When were they to be completed?

Mr. A. K. MACLEAN: To be completed as soon as possible—within a year.

Mr. REID: The hon. gentleman said $160?

Mr. A. K. MACLEAN: Yes.

Mr. REID: I may say that, within the last year, the lowest price of any contract I have heard of was $160 a ton. I have not heard of any within the last two years, either in the United States or in Canada, at $125.

Mr. A. K. MACLEAN: You can enter into contracts to-day for the construction of steel ships somewhere between $155 and $160 a ton.

Mr. STEVENS: Within the last week the Japanese Government has offered $225 a ton for steel ships.

Mr. A. K. MACLEAN: That is quite true, and I know of the British Government paying nearly $200 a ton for shipping, at a time when tonnage could be purchased in the United States for $140 or $150. Those are exceptions which do not prove the rule. At the present moment the Government has not entered into any contract for the construction of wooden ships, as I understand. A contract was entered into, but the contractors failed to carry out the contract.

Mr. REID: And the contracts that were entered into were for less than $100 a ton.

Mr. A. K. MACLEAN: The contractors could not carry out their contract, claiming that the price was too low, and now they want $125 a ton for wooden ships, and are unwilling to give a guarantee positively for construction within any reasonable period. Wooden shipping is not the kind of tonnage which this Government should purchase If they are going to operate a line of steamships between the Pacific and Atlantic coasts, it would be far better to pay an additional initial cost of $50 or $60 a ton, than to buy wooden ships at $125 a ton, because the ships must pass through tropical waters, where their bottoms are subjected to attacks of all sorts of worms and insects which infest those waters, and which are more or less destructive to wooden shipping.

If a government owns wooden shipping, there is no end to the capital expenditures which commence the first year after construction. It would be infinitely cheaper, if we are going into this business at all, to enter into contracts for the construction of steel ships. I would not do even that; if we wish to encourage interprovincial trade via the Panama canal, it would be far better for us to pay a reasonable subsidy to some steamship company that was willing to make an investment and go into this work.

Mr. REID: That cannot be done because no one will undertake it.

Mr. A. K. MACLEAN: They may not do it at the present time, but it will be a long time before the Government receives delivery of these wooden ships, and there is no trade now between the Atlantic coast and the Pacific coast.

Mr. REID: There is.

Mr. A. K. MACLEAN: I doubt if there is at this time. I would like to see a steamship line operating between the Pacific coast and the eastern coast of Canada, but it would be better to have such a line owned and operated by a private company, because a private company could go where they liked for traffic. There is, however, no business for a line of steamships to-day between British Columbia and the Maritime Provinces. The Minister of Customs spent eight days in British Columbia amongst his political friends, and I have no doubt he was pressed quite strongly by them to do something of this nature. He confessed to us that what he was pressed to do was to appoint a customs officer at New York. The people of British Columbia have been wanting that for a long time. Personally, I have not been able to see any substantial objection to that.

Mr. REID: That is what I say.

Mr. A. K. MACLEAN: To get out of it, the minister says he developed this theory about the building of wooden ships. It was a shame that he should have allowed the Minister of Railways, for two or three hours this afternoon, to battle with hon. members on this side in defence of his scheme. The Minister of Customs should have spoken before recess. He speaks about the traffic these two ships would get between the East and the West. It is true that some traffic might be developed between the eastern and the western ports of Canada by means of a steamship line of this nature—I would hardly be an authority on that point. The hon. gentleman speaks about wood. Very little wood would go to the Maritime Provinces from British Columbia, because in the Maritime Provinces we produce more than enough for ourselves; we are exporters. New Brunswick, for instance, is a very heavy exporter of lumber to the European markets. We frequently require heavy timber from British Columbia, but the total purchases during a year would not amount to very much and the shipments are usually brought to the Atlantic coast by rail. That would be much cheaper than bringing it by water, because one would never want to bring a whole shipload of timber from the Pacific coast to the Atlantic.

Mr. STEVENS: Shipload after shipload of timber has come from British Columbia to the Atlantic coast of Canada—35,000,000 feet was brought to Toronto on one order

Mr. A. K. MACLEAN: What was the dimension of that timber?

Mr. STEVENS: Large dimensions. The same is true of Quebec, St. John and Halifax. During the last two years every port on the Atlantic coast has been buying millions and millions of feet of timber from British Columbia.

Mr. A. K. MACLEAN: I am referring to long timber, which I know comes to the eastern provinces by rail.

Mr. STEVENS: I am referring to shiploads of timber, whether you call it long, short, or any other kind.

Mr. A. K. MACLEAN: An occasional shipload may come from British Columbia to the Maritime Provinces, but not enough to justify the construction and operation of two steamships.

9 p.m.

This vote, which contemplates the construction and operation of two steamships, is not really a vote of the Intercolonial railway system, and we ought not to be asked to pass it upon that basis. If the Intercolonial railway are going into the steamship business they should not purchase wooden shipping at $125 per ton; they should wait until steel tonnage is available, because for the present and for possibly a year or two there will be very little traffic between the Pacific coast and the Atlantic coast. If this vote is for developing trade between the Atlantic and the Pacific coast, and as it is the judgment of hon. members that that should be done in one form or another, it should be done by a subvention granted to a company experienced in the operation and management of steamships.

Mr. STEVENS: My hon. friend and other hon. gentlemen opposite have referred very slightingly to the trade between the eastern part and the western part of Canada. I will enumerate, as far as I can, some of the things we want to buy from the East and some of the things we sell to the East. For instance, through my efforts, a large nail factory on the Coast changed its purchases of steel rods from Great Britain to Nova Scotia, and it is now buying from the Nova Scotia Steel Company about two or three carloads of steel rods per month.

Mr. A. K. MACLEAN: When did that happen?

Mr. STEVENS: It is going on now.

Mr. A. K. MACLEAN: When did it start?

[Mr. Stevens.]

Mr. STEVENS: Within the last two years.

Mr. A. K. MACLEAN: The Pacific coast, of course, would be glad to buy steel rods from any place to-day.

Mr. STEVENS: This firm desired to buy them in Canada and it was through an arrangement made with the Intercolonial railway and the Nova Scotia Steel Company that the transaction was effected.

Mr. A. K. MACLEAN: They could not get them in Great Britain.

Mr. NESBITT: Or in the United States.

Mr. STEVENS: We buy from Ontario large quantities of wire fencing and all manner of agricultural and milling machinery. Practically all our saw mill machinery comes from Ontario and Quebec. We have to transport that by vessel, or we have to pay a very high rate of freight for the long haul by rail. We buy a great deal of our hams, bacon and other produce of that kind from Ontario or from packers in Seattle and Portland. British Columbia buys large quantities of canned goods for use in the mining camps in the northern parts of British Columbia and in the Yukon. Hundreds of thousands of dollars' worth of canned goods a year now brought from California, could be brought from eastern Canada—a considerable quantity is bought from eastern Canada now. When there was an occasional ship sailing from New York to the Pacific coast British Columbia dealers would buy the goods in eastern Canada, ship them to New York and from there to Seattle, pay the duty, and still manage to carry on the business. If we can buy in eastern Canada and bring these goods via the Panama canal direct to Vancouver of Victoria, that will eliminate the duty and will enable us to do business on what we consider a reasonable and fair basis. My hon. friend speaks slightingly of the timber business. We do not deprecate the timber business of Nova Scotia and New Brunswick; we know there is a certain amount of it in those provinces. But for heavy construction, you have to get timber that is not produced in Nova Scotia or New Brunswick. For years and years you have been importing southern pine from Mississippi, Louisiana and Georgia. We can supply the finest of timber just as cheaply or more cheaply than you can get it from the southern states. Why then, in the name of Heaven, should not the western part of Canada serve the East with timber and the East supply the

West with other goods? A British Columbia broker about a year ago last March went to Kingston, Jamaica, and in nine months he developed a trade between eastern Canada and Jamaica amounting to $180,000 for last year. He is trying to do business with the West. I had a letter from him only yesterday. We can export from the western coast oats, hay, lumber, shingles, fish, potatoes, and other such products and we can import the products of the West Indies. This line of ships is designed to do this trade between the ports of eastern Canada and of British Columbia via Jamaica and the Panama canal.

There you have a perfect trade route: part of your cargo from eastern Canada will be for the West Indies and part of it for British Columbia, and vice versa. I cannot see why hon. gentlemen opposite object to the construction of these two ships for the purpose of initiating that trade route. The member for Pictou (Mr. Macdonald) said this afternoon that we wanted all the tonnage we could get on the Atlantic in order that the products of the Maritime Provinces might be taken to Europe. I would point out that scores of ships have been taken from the Pacific coast to carry on that trade between the Atlantic seaboard and Europe. I do not dispute the importance of that trade, but there should be no objection to the building of a couple of small and comparatively cheap wooden ships to keep up the trade between the two coasts of Canada.

Mr. A. K. MACLEAN: The hon. gentleman tries to make it appear that I opposed any effort in the direction of developing the interprovincial trade to which he refers. I thought I made it clear that I was not against that, but I did say I would take other means to that end. I object to the purchase and operation by the Government of these wooden ships.

Mr. STEVENS: My hon. friend may be perfectly sincere in what he says, but he ridiculed the idea of trade between eastern Canada and the West.

Mr. A. K. MACLEAN: Just at present.

Mr. STEVENS: The hon. gentleman is wrong; a very extensive trade is being carried on now, in spite of prevailing handicaps, between eastern and western Canada. Even to-day we purchase from the manufacturing concerns of Seattle, Portland, San Francisco and other western cities very large quantities of manufactured goods which we could buy in Ontario, Quebec and the Maritime Provinces. We feel that we would rather purchase those goods within Canadian territory, and we can do that if we get the transportation facilities.

Mr. A. K. MACLEAN: Would Ontario goods go over that route?

Mr. STEVENS: Certainly.

Mr. NESBITT: Would it be cheaper to ship via Halifax and the Panama canal from western Ontario than to send the goods overland?

Mr. STEVENS: Yes. The freight rate from Toronto in the winter time via Halifax around by the Panama canal to Vancouver is very much cheaper than the rate from Toronto overland. We secured reams of detail in this matter; the Board of Trade looked into it; a delegation came here and demonstrated beyond question the fact that transport by this proposed route would be infinitely cheaper than by rail. Even now we buy goods from the eastern States, take them to New York, ship them by an American line to Seattle, tranship to Vancouver, pay the duty, and beat out Canadian overland freight rate.

Mr. PUGSLEY: I have here a copy of the contract which the minister was good enough to lay on the Table, and I want to give a few particulars as to the specifications. The length of keel is set out as 225 feet; breadth of vessel, 44 feet; depth of hold, 19 feet. On the basis of $230,000, the cost of the machinery, and plans, etc., was to be $115,000; the rest would go for the hull. One half, therefore, would be for the hull and the other half for machinery and plans. It is proposed to pay $300,000 for each of these ships.

Mr. COCHRANE: Oh, no, it is not.

Mr. PUGSLEY: That is what the minister is asking.

Mr. COCHRANE: That does not mean that he is going to pay it.

Mr. PUGSLEY: That would be at the rate of $120 a ton. As the member for Halifax (Mr. A. K. Maclean) pointed out, that is nearly the cost of a steel vessel. At all events, the owners of shipyards in the eastern provinces ought to have an opportunity of tendering for these ships. The Minister of Customs says that the reason why tenders were not invited from eastern Canada was because it would cost more to build the ships there; that they had not the timber in eastern Canada.

At present the construction of two ships is being proceeded with in St. John for the Imperial Munitions Board; I think each vessel is 2,500 tons, the same tonnage as that of the ships here contracted for by the minister.

Mr. REID: Captain Norcross, the head of the Canada West Coast Navigation Company, told me that there were some little extras that would probably have to be added to the amount of that contract. He told me also that the vessels could not be built as quickly for the price in eastern Canada; that is why the contract went to British Columbia.

Mr. PUGSLEY: I would assume that the contract of the Canada West Coast Navigation Company was at a somewhat lower rate. These specifications say that some additions are made in the schedule; I assume that they would be included in the $230,000.

Mr. REID: There were some others in addition to that.

Mr. PUGSLEY: The Minister of Customs says that he advised the Minister of Railways to undertake this work. But the Minister of Customs himself, not the Minister of Railways, signed this contract. The signatures are as follows:

Wallace Shipyards, Limited,
(Signed) A. Wallace, Managing Director.
(Signed) J. D. Reid, Acting Minister of Railways and Canals.

Mr. REID: The Minister of Railways knew all about it; if I remember rightly, he signed the Order in Council. He happened to be away at the time, but it was all submitted to and confirmed by him.

Mr. PUGSLEY: The reason why the Intercolonial railway is charged with the burden of these two ships is that the Minister of Customs was at Vancouver about a year ago. He got in touch with the enterprising gentlemen of Vancouver, and he promised this steamboat connection between the Atlantic and the Pacific. He had to carry out his promise when he came back, and that is why this burden is laid upon the Department of Railways rather than upon the Trade and Commerce Department, where the burden would be chargeable to the general revenue of Canada. I protest against this additional burden being laid upon the Intercolonial railway, with which this steamship line will not be in any way connected.

Of course I can understand why the Minister of Customs should take hold of it in the Railway Department, because he knew perfectly well if he left it to the Department of Trade and Commerce he would never get it. My hon. friend heard the Minister of Trade and Commerce reproached for not doing anything for the encouragement of shipbuilding in Canada, and saw that the minister simply told us in that dreamy style of his of the great ideas he had for the development of shipbuilding after the war. The Minister of Customs could not wait so long, because he had promised the people of Vancouver to deal with the matter more quickly. The Minister of Trade and Commerce spoke this afternoon with reference to the charge that the Government had done nothing for the encouragement of shipbuilding. He admitted it, but he showed the difficulties in the way and said "You cannot get steel plates to-day." Well, if that is the case to-day it has not been the case during the three years since the war began, when if proper encouragement had been given the building of ships could have been undertaken most successfully in Canada. I want to read a newspaper extract showing what the United States Government is doing in the way of shipbuilding, and I would ask the committee and the people of this country to contrast it with the do-nothing policy of this Government during the last three years:

A Washington despatch says that contracts for the construction of three immense government-owned shipyards for building fabricated steel merchant vessels have been awarded to the Submarine Boat Corporation at Newark, N.J., the American International Corporation at Hog Island, Pa., and the Merchants Shipbuilding Company at Chester, Pa. Each yard will cost $35,000,000 and contracts have been let for 200 ships to be built in each.

Within comparatively few weeks of the United States becoming engaged in the war, they have provided for the creation of three great shipyards, and let contracts for the building of 600 steel ships. Such an example of the vigorous way in which the United States is engaged in shipbuilding ought to put this Government to shame.

Mr. CURRIE: How many ships have they built?

Mr. PUGSLEY: The contract is for 600.

Mr. CURRIE: They have not built one ship. It is only a week since they gave the contracts.

Mr. PUGSLEY: They have only been in the war a few weeks. Although they have only been engaged in the war a short time, they have already made arrangements for these three shipbuilding plants,

and have given contracts for 600 vessels. That is a record which puts this Government, which has done nothing in the direction of shipbuilding, in a position they ought to feel. In the past this Government has neglected their duty to the country, but even at this late day they ought to be encouraged to make a different course and engage without delay in the building of a reasonable number of ships in order to meet so far as possible the requirements of our country and of the Empire.

Mr. CURRIE: I have no desire to delay this item, but having some interest in the matter, it might be well for me to place certain facts before the Committee. A great deal of the time of the House this afternoon was spent in discussing the impossible. Hon. gentlemen opposite have been scolding the Government, and denouncing the Minister of Railways and everybody generally, because the Government has not taken up the question of shipbuilding, especially of steel shipbuilding. When the war broke out, there was very little business to be had by any of the shipbuilding firms. As a matter of fact, in 1915, there was no business. The only people who were building any ships were the Standard Oil Company, and they were getting them so cheaply, and had such foresight, that they gave certain contracts to some of the yards, at low prices. Since the submarine policy of the Germans has succeeded in destroying a large number of vessels, and freight tonnage has gone up on the Atlantic, shipbuilding in Canada has had a great boom. A steel ship that could have been bought for $40,000 in 1915 will easily sell to-day for $350,000. I am now speaking of second-hand twenty-year old ships. At the present moment there is not a steel shipbuilding yard in eastern Canada, that is, Collingwood, Kingston, Toronto, Montreal, or Levis, that would take a contract to build a ship inside of two years, because they are filled up with orders at remunerative prices for that time, and even longer. I know this to be a fact. If you want to build a ship, where are you going to get the material? There is absolutely no material available inside of two years. We cannot bring plate from Europe, and all the plate the American mills can produce for the next two years is sold or booked. The price of plate has gone up as high as $160 to $175 a ton, whereas before the war and during 1915 it could be purchased as low as $34 a ton. From this it will be apparent that the cost of shipbuilding has gone up enormously—over $100 a ton for the steel for the hulls alone. My hon. friend says you can get it for $80 a ton. Why, the added cost alone is over $100 a ton. A ship of 2,500 tons burden will take, roughly, about a similar quantity of structural steel and plate. The plate mill which was at Sydney was sold to the United States since the war began, exported out of Canada, and I understand is now employed making plate in the United States. At the time this mill was purchased it was impossible to sell any plate in Canada, and there was no work whatever for it to do. At the present time every plate mill in America is employed. Every pound of steel that can be got to a plate mill is sent there, because of the high price of plates. If a man were prepared to-morrow to supply the structural steel and plates for a ship, or two ships, or ten ships, he would not be one day with his books unfilled. The question then arises, what is the next best policy? They have a board in the United States, to which my hon. friend has referred, which was established with the idea of building ships for the United States Government. The first board was divided in its views as to whether the ships should be built of steel or of wood. Two of the members resigned because they held the view that some of the ships should be built of wood, whereas the president of the board would not agree to this view. The result was that the commission delayed action and was dismissed, and another appointed, and a certain number of wooden ships are to be built. If any one wants a ship built in this country inside of a year or so there is only one way to get it built, and that is to have it built of wood. There is only one place in Canada that I know of where there is plenty of cheap wood to be had, that is in British Columbia, so that the Government, in adopting the idea of building the ships could not do anything but have the ships built in British Columbia. Hon. gentlemen have stated it would be wrong to build wooden ships when you can build steel ships. I agree with that. But if you cannot build iron ships, and you want ships, you must take what you can get—the wooden ones. The tonnage of the world has been reduced to such an extent that I think the Government has been very modest, indeed, in placing orders for only two ships. I think they would have been amply justified in giving contracts for at least ten more of these wooden ships of, say, 2,500 tons burden, to assist in the carrying of freight from this country to Great Britain, as well

as the other work of the Intercolonial. Those ships would be classed A-1 by Lloyds, and would have a life of about seven years. The freight charges from three voyages of one of those ships would more than pay for the ship. It is the freights that can be earned by ships that make ships valuable to-day. They are paying as high as $60 a ton across the Atlantic.

Mr. A. K. MACLEAN: My hon. friend is wrong because he would be competing against Canadian railways, and rates would have to be as low or lower than Canadian rail rates. My hon. friend is talking about transatlantic freights.

Mr. CURRIE: I am going to deal with the question of rates between East and West by and by. I am speaking of what it costs to ship goods abroad.

Mr. A. K. MACLEAN: The hon. gentleman was in error when he was talking about the excessive freight rates which these wooden ships would earn. He is referring to the case of transatlantic rates.

Mr. CURRIE: I am going to deal with that if the hon. gentleman will keep quiet for a few minutes. I am talking about transatlantic freight. The rate is as high as $60 a ton for transatlantic freight, this is because tonnage is not to be had. That is why there is such a demand for ships and material. For that reason the Government are absolutely justified in going into the building of ships, because there is going to be a great shortage of ships for the next six or seven years. Any kind of ships that will carry tonnage to any part of the world are sure to receive ample freight and high rates for that work.

Mr. PUGSLEY: But the trouble is that they have not built any ships yet.

Mr. CURRIE: I am going to come back to the United States to point out to the hon. member for St. John that in the United States for the past six or seven years——

Mr. PUGSLEY: Six or seven years?

Mr. CURRIE: Six or seven months, a crimp has occurred in tonnage on account of the tremendous losses caused by the submarines. That condition did not exist in the first half of the war. During the first half of the war the submarine damage did not amount to anything. But tonnage on the ocean has now become short. If we cannot get iron and steel plates—and everybody knows we cannot—it is absurd to talk about building steel ships. Ships now can only be built of wood.

Now, I come to the question of trade between East and West. The Panama canal was built for the purpose of carrying freight between the Pacific and Atlantic coasts of the United States. It is extremely fortunate for this country that we are able to utilize that canal for the carrying trade between the East and the West. Unlike the United States, we have a stopping place at Jamaica and other others of the the British West Indian islands which are British territory and many of which give a preference to Canadian trade. They are a great advantage to us, and the trade with them is going to be much more extensive when matters become settled again. Then, there are Mexico, Venezuela and other Central American countries which Canada has only recently been able to touch. I know from personal experience that trade is now going on between Canada and Colombia and other Central American countries, whereas we never got a dollar of it before. That trade can be built up into a vast business. We hear gentlemen from Nova Scotia always kicking about the trade of this country. They have been up in arms against the National Policy and they have set the eastern provinces back twenty-five years by the course which they have pursued. Iron is taken from Sydney to Toronto, made into stoves and sent back to Sydney and to other places in the East and sold or exported. In many other things a similar process takes place. Why should that be? The development of manufacturers in the Maritime Provinces has been discouraged by this free trade talk. Instead of encouraging the people to build up industries in their own towns and villages as Ontario has done, they became discouraged and have gone over to the New England States and carried on the industries there with their brains and ability. As a matter of fact if you enter any of the great shops in the New England States and are sent to the manager, to the man whose brains and energy are building up these large plants which are employing thousands of workmen, you will find that he is a Canadian, a native of Nova Scotia or New Brunswick who has left this country. Why? Because the public men, the men who rule the destinies of these provinces, are opposed to building up the industries of those provinces, and they are just as much opposed to any increase in the manufacturing industry to-day as they have been in the past.

Mr. A. K. MACLEAN: We are making stoves in Nova Scotia and selling them in British Columbia.

Mr. CURRIE: That is very lately.

Mr. A. K. MACLEAN: No, long years ago.

Mr. CURRIE: Only a few years. Most of the hardware has been made outside of Nova Scotia. It is only within a few years that there was such a thing as a slide rule in Nova Scotia. The educational system was along the line of the classics—Greek and Latin—and it was only when the industries were started at Amherst and Sydney that they began manufacturing hardware products. Then, to-day, we have the hon. member for Guysborough (Mr. Sinclair) talking free trade in ships; and it is argued that the cost of ships is cheaper in England than in any other place in the world. That has been due to the fact that skilled mechanics in England and Scotland got such low wages. But that condition has changed and shipbuilding will never be carried on in any part of the world as cheaply as it has been in the past. There is no merit in low wages, and there is no merit in producing goods at a loss. The only thing that there is merit in is making a profit. What benefit is it to a man if he does not get a profit out of his employment?

Mr. A. K. MACLEAN: Do I understand my hon. friend to say that each country should manufacture within itself everything that it consumes?

Mr. CURRIE: That is a very primary question in political economy and every one in the lower grade—

Mr. A. K. MACLEAN: Answer.

Mr. CURRIE: A student in the lower grade of political economy would know that.

Mr. A. K. MACLEAN: What is my hon. friend's answer?

Mr. CURRIE: There is a certain country to-day that is carrying on a great war and that is Germany—

Mr. A. K. MACLEAN: Answer the question.

Mr. CURRIE: It is manufacturing and doing all its own business within its own borders at the present time, and it still seems to be getting along famously with it. If we were to purchase less from abroad and if we did not purchase unnecessary things in the United States our credit might be better than it is to-day.

Mr. SINCLAIR: Does the hon. gentleman think the Germans are getting on better than Great Britain is?

Mr. CURRIE: Being a loyal British subject the hon. gentleman would not expect any answer from me to that question, but what I do say is that that country is not getting along better.

Mr. A. K. MACLEAN: Would the hon. gentleman allow me to interrupt him?

The CHAIRMAN (Mr. Rainville): I would request the hon. gentleman (Mr. Currie) to come back to the question of ship-building.

Mr. CURRIE: This is just a little digression. Hon. gentleman have been making political speeches all afternoon.

Mr. A. K. MACLEAN: I am correct then, am I not, in the understanding that it is the hon. gentleman's view that Canada and all the countries of the world should manufacture for themselves everything they require and that being the case there would be no need of shipping.

Mr. CURRIE: The hon. gentleman is endeavouring to put an answer into my mouth which, he knows very well, I did not give, because it is our business and should be our business as a country which is undertaking great expenditures in this war to sell and export as much as possible and to buy as little as possible from other countries if we are going to pay our debts. That is an answer which my hon. friend might sleep over and figure out the meaning of in the morning.

Now, to come back to the question of ships; the time of the House was spent idly this afternoon in discussing the question of expanding the shipbuilding industry. The Government has done wonders. My hon. friend the Minister of Marine and Fisheries (Mr. Hazen) has assisted in placing contracts in every shipbuilding yard that is available in this country. To-day you cannot find ten feet of yard space that is not employed. Every machine shop, every engine-buiding concern, is filled with contracts for marine engines. So far as the policy of this Government in purchasing and having built wooden ships is concerned, I think it is a most excellent policy, and that the people of this country would justify the Government in building not only two ships but twenty, because they will be needed. Twenty wooden ships would

not be too many, because you cannot get the steel plate to build steel vessels unless you wait for three or four years, and that would be too long to wait if we want to increase the export of the goods of this country. One thing that is militating against the increase of the munitions industry in this country and causing the closing down of munitions work, is that tonnage is not available to export shells. I have in mind one yard where I saw piled up from eight to ten thousand tons of steel shells and ingots for use in Great Britain, piled up and rusting for the reason that there is no tonnage. The hon. member says private capital should build the ships. But every dollar of private capital that can be got to go into ships is in shipbuilding at the present time, and the only thing to do is for the Government to get what tonnage they can for Canada, and to carry on in the way they are doing. It seems absurd for this House or any member to claim that the Government is not doing its duty so far as shipbuilding is concerned. The shipbuilding industry in this country is more flourishing than the shell-making or any other industry, even farming, and for that reason the claim that the Government is not doing its duty towards that industry is absurd. I repeat that it is absolutely necessary for this country to see that in trade the East and West are joined together. The United States Government, when it built the Panama canal only two years ago, passed a law that no railroad company would be allowed to carry on the business of steamship transportation through the Panama canal. The American people claimed that a line of steamers through the canal should be controlled by the United States Government. Thus we are going along the lines suggested by the Americans. Many of those ships that are now being built—the thousand ships that the hon. member has mentioned—are for this very trade. Are we going to be behind the Americans? Is it not necessary for us to carry on our business in the same way as they are doing? I repeat that the Government are amply justified in this course, and if we are to have a great railway system such as we have, we must have its complement in the ships, and I think the time of this House has perhaps been well spent in showing up the absolute ignorance of hon. gentlemen opposite of the business of shipbuilding in this country.

Mr. SINCLAIR: Will the hon. member tell us what kind of boats the Minister of Marine is building? It is news to us that the minister has a large number of ships under construction, and I feel interested. Are they steel or wooden ships?

Mr. CURRIE: I understand that the Minister of Marine will have his own estimates under consideration and then the House can get full information.

Mr. A. K. MACLEAN: I do not see why the hon. member should not give us all the information we want on any subject whatever.

Mr. CURRIE: He is building both wood and iron ships, so far as I can ascertain.

Mr. SINCLAIR: But the hon. member told us a minute ago that we could not build any steel ships.

Mr. CURRIE: The contracts were let before the rush period. You cannot have your cake and eat it.

To provide amount required to be paid for the Quebec, Montmorency and Charlevoix railway, the Quebec and Saguenay railway and the Lotbinière and Megantic railway, and for the equipment, appurtenances and properties used in connection with such railways, to be acquired under the authority of a statute passed at the last session; and to provide for the cost of completing, equipping and operating the said railways—the operating expenses to be chargeable to revenue—revote, $3,667,745.07.

Mr. PUGSLEY: Would the minister explain how this amount of $3,667,745.07 is arrived at? It puzzles me to know how the minister could get it down right to the 7 cents. The amount is to be determined by the judge of the Exchequer Court.

Mr. COCHRANE: Four million dollars was put in last year and the difference between this amount and $4,000,000 was spent last year on construction.

Mr. PUGSLEY: I should like to know how the minister came to arrive at $4,000,000. Under the statute, the amount to be paid was left to be settled by the Exchequer Court, and it was provided that the judge must be guided by the actual value based on the cost, deducting the amount of subsidies. In reading over the judgment of the judge of the Exchequer Court, I find that he leaves the amount very indefinite. In respect to one road, the Quebec and Montmorency, the claim being made that the value was some $2,000,000, I find it stated that the representative of my hon. friend, who would be the counsel for the Crown, stated that he was perfectly willing that this two million odd dollars should

be taken as the cost of the road. The judge, however, says that he cannot accept that view. He says that it strikes him as utterly absurd that a road like that could have cost in the vicinity of $90,000 per mile, which this $2,000,000 would represent. He declines to accept that view, and concludes that a large portion of the alleged $2,000,000 never went into the road, that the road never cost anything like that money, and that hundreds and thousands of dollars which it was claimed had gone into the road in the opinion of the judge, had not gone into it. The judge leaves that and a number of other questions entirely unsettled and suggests that there should be an appeal, if anybody thinks he is wronged, to the Supreme Court of Canada in order to set him right if he is wrong. How did the minister come to put in the $4,000,000 last year?

Mr. REID: That was all explained last year at the time the Bill went through.

Mr. PUGSLEY: The difficulty is that in these times the people are apt to forget the explanation. I notice a determined effort on the part of the Government now in its legislation to try to induce the people to forget all these things—to forget the Quebec and Saguenay, to forget the Canadian Northern railway, to forget a great many of the evil matters which this Government has perpetrated upon the people of this country; and it is well that their memory should be refreshed in reference to this Quebec and Saguenay deal. I do not think it out of place to ask how the minister arrived at $4,000,000. The Minister of Customs has such an imagination that I am rather afraid to let him explain.

Mr. COCHRANE: He put it through last year and explained it then.

Mr. PUGSLEY: If he will really keep down to facts and not draw too much on his imagination—

Mr. REID: I put this matter through the House last year, as the minister was ill and I was acting for him. At that time I gave a statement showing the estimated cost of the three different railways, first the Quebec and Montmorency, on which it was stated there were two and one-half million bonds, then the Megantic and Lotbinière, which I think it was stated, cost $332,000—I am trusting to my memory, in regard to these figures. I have not the figures of the Quebec and Saguenay, but there was a very large amount spent on that road, and bonds were issued to a large amount; I cannot recall the figures. But this company stated that they were willing to take, I think fifty cents on the dollar for the amount invested. At all events the whole three amounts were added together, and it was estimated the amount would be about $4,000,000, and in addition there were the $2,500,000 of bonds. It was provided that if it found that the Quebec and Montmorency did not cost the amount stated, the difference was to be taken out of the purchase price; and if the Megantic and Lotbiniere road, or the Quebec and Saguenay, did not cost the amount stated, the amounts to be allowed would be reduced accordingly. The whole matter was left entirely to the judge of the Exchequer Court. It has been before the judge, and on his judgment the Government must settle this matter. The judge, as I understand it has not come to a final decision; that is, the parties do not agree that his judgment is sufficient.

Mr. PUGSLEY: Has there been an appeal by either side?

Mr. REID: No, but the matter is still before the judge. In the meantime, after this Bill had been passed, the Government started to finish the construction, and it was necessary to do so, because the work already done was fast deteriorating. The valuation, of course, as explained last year, was on the basis of what it was before the work was stopped, and any deterioration and any subsidies were to be deducted. The work was started. Contractors were put to work to complete the road, and three hundred and some odd thousand dollars have already been expended in building bridges and making grades and getting the road ready for the laying of rails. I understand that if the rails could be procured they would have that road in operation to Murray Bay this fall, but the difficulty has been to get new rails. That is the position, and all we are asking now is to have the matter in the Exchequer Court, where it now is, and leave the vote as it is, so that after the judge of the Exchequer Court gives his decision we may be in a position, with the amount voted last year and now revoted, to settle the transaction. If they do not come to any conclusion, the matter remains as it was, with this exception, that the road will be completed and in operation. Until the judge gives that decision, and the owners give the title, of course no payments can be made on the capital of the road. But the Government can use the small portion of this road, and put it in operation and let

the public have the advantage of it, pending the final decision.

Mr. LEMIEUX: I am very glad of the explanation given just now by my hon. friend the Minister of Customs. It shows that if the Government were to abandon part of this scheme and confine its efforts to completing the latter portion, it would be the best thing for Canada and the taxpayers. Last year the Department of Railways and Canals decided to purchase three different railways. First the Lotbinière and Megantic on the south shore, the Quebec and Montmorency, running from Quebec to St. Joachim, and the Quebec and Saguenay, running from the terminus of the Quebec and Montmorency to Nairn's Falls. Out of this third section about nine miles have been constructed at the tail-end of the line, from Murray Bay to Nairn's Falls. Parliament last year decided, at the same time, that the value of the three railways should be fixed by the Exchequer Court. The section of the statute, chapter 22 of 67 George V, reads:

> The consideration to be paid for each of the said railways and for any equipment appurtenances and properties that may be acquired as aforesaid, shall be the value thereof as determined by the Exchequer Court of Canada; said value to be the actual cost of said railways less subsidies and less depreciation, but not to exceed $4,349,000, exclusive of outstanding bonded indebtedness, which is to be assumed by the Government, but not to exceed in all $2,500,000.

Subsequently the Government put in the supplementary estimates of last year the sum of $4,000,000. The item reads:

> To provide amount required to be paid for the Quebec, Montmorency and Charlevoix Railway, the Quebec and Saguenay Railway and the Lotbinière and Megantic Railway, and for the equipment, appurtenances and properties used in connection with such railways, to be acquired under the authority of a statute passed at the present session; and to provide for the cost of completing, equipping and operating the said railway—the operating expenses to be chargeable to revenue—revote, $4,000,000.

This year the item reads as it did last year. But I must remind my hon. friend and the Minister of Railways and Canals that this item cannot be spent unless it is spent by virtue of the statute passed last year. I do not see how the Department of Railways and Canals could spend any sum out of that vote without the Exchequer Court having passed on and fixed the value. However, after Parliament was prorogued, the matter was referred to the Exchequer Court. The railway companies and the department were represented. The department meanwhile made an agreement which was signed by the parties, embodying the statute—the will of Parliament.

The question came up before the Exchequer Court. As I stated a moment ago, the companies were represented by very able counsel, and so was the Department of Railways and Canals. The railway companies filed a claim on which they did their best to make a case which would give them the right to obtain these amounts:

For the Quebec, Montmorency and Charlevoix	$2,942,397.58
For the Lotbinière and Megantic	349,208.85
For the Quebec and Saguenay	5,543,867.32

But they were limited by the statute which had been passed a few months before by this Parliament. The maximum price agreed by Parliament to be paid was $4,349,000 plus the assuming by the Government of debentures of the Quebec, Montmorency and Charlevoix railway amounting to $2,500,000, making a total of $6,849,000 as against $8,834,867.32 as claimed by the railway companies. I am pleased to say that the case came before Sir Walter Cassels who gave his attention to it, and throughout the many sittings of the Ex-

10 p.m.

chequer Court, as evidenced by the bulky documents which I have perused, Sir Walter Cassels protected the interests of the department and of the Dominion to a remarkable degree. Nobody need be surprised at that; he did his plain duty, but I am glad to pay him this compliment that he was the faithful protector of Canada in that case. What happened? It would take too long to go through the voluminous evidence which was unravelled before Sir Walter Cassels, but in the case of the Quebec, Montmorency and Charlevoix railway, he deducted first $500,000 for one item and then $794,869.58 for another, making a total of $1,294,869.58.

Mr. NESBITT: What were those items for?

Mr. LEMIEUX: I will give that information in a moment. Those two items had been admitted by the counsel of the Government, but notwithstanding that admission, Sir Walter Cassels said: No, I will not accept them; the company is not entitled to those two items; and I will put them aside. The $500,000 was supposed to have gone into the construction of the railway, but according to the evidence, the judge found that amount had not gone into construction. The other item of $794,869.58 was floating liabilities. Let me read the

reference by Sir Walter Cassels to the admission of the counsel. He says:

Now it is admitted that these two items of $500,000 referred to in schedule "A" and also the item of $794,869.58 floating liabilities, comprise part of this item of $2,038,149.40. Crown counsel in their statement were of opinion that these two items of $500,000 and $794,869.58 should be taken as the cost up to that date, namely, July 1, 1898. I do not agree with that contention. I fail to see how it can be assumed without further proof that the proceeds of these interim bonds, namely $500,000, went into the construction of the railway. They may or they may not. That is a question of proof.

But the judge said there had been no proof of that amount having entered into the construction of the road. That is as regards the Quebec, Montmorency and Charlevoix railway.

We come now to the Lotbinière, Megantic railway which was the subject of a claim on the part of the railway company for $349,208.85. The evidence which I read did not satisfy Sir Walter Cassels, who said: Only one witness, a Mr. Robbins, was heard. He claims that that road cost $11,000 per mile; this is only a surmise; there is no positive evidence, and his evidence in any case is too airy; I cannot accept it until further evidence is given, and therefore, I put aside the amount claimed for the Lotbinière and Megantic.

Then he comes to the Quebec and Saguenay. The company claimed $5,543,867.32. Sir Walter Cassels puts aside, first, the discount on two flotations of bonds, amounting to $863,000; second, the fees for the listing of bonds, amounting to $63,465.09; third, interest on the bond issue, $1,012,950. So that for that third railway Sir Walter Cassels deducted from the claim made by the company $1,939,415.09. Sir Walter Cassels, after giving his reasons for his judgment, says that he anticipates an appeal from his judgment by the railway companies. The other day I stated to the committee that an appeal had been lodged, but I have since ascertained that I was mistaken; an appeal had been lodged by the same people in another case. Unless the company appeal from that judgment it will hold good, and the Minister of Railways cannot come to any settlement with the company unless he accepts the reductions made by Sir Walter Cassels, amounting, for the three railways, to $2,751,985. The counsel for the department recommended the payment of that large amount, but were met by the deductions of Judge Cassels. Last year the member for Kingston (Mr. Nickle), when this question came up before the House, used very strong language.

Mr. REID: With reference to the two items that the hon. gentleman says counsel agreed to accept; what were they for?

Mr. LEMIEUX: They were the item for $500,000, which was supposed to have been used towards the construction of the Quebec and Montmorency, and the other big item in connection with the floating liabilities. The judge rejected these.

Mr. REID: Was there any detail in respect of the floating liabilities?

Mr. LEMIEUX: Let me read again this paragraph from the judgment:

Now it is admitted that these two items of $500,000 referred to in schedule "A" and also the item of $794,869.58, floating liabilities, comprise part of this item of $2,038,149.40. Crown counsel in their statement were of opinion that these two items of $500,000 and $794,869.58 should be taken as the cost up to that date, namely, July 1, 1898. I do not agree with that contention. I fail to see how it can be assumed without further proof that the proceeds of these interim bonds, namely, $500,000, went into the construction of the railway. They may or may not. That is a question of proof. The bonds were held by the various parties shown on page 15 of schedule "A"; they were held as collateral security by the various parties. What the nature of the debts due to these various parties is I would have thought susceptible of proof—at all events, before such an item can be allowed further inquiry will be necessary, and so with regard to the liabilities. Unquestionably a considerable portion of them never went into the railway. Colonel Wurtele states as follows:

Colonel Wurtele was one of the witnesses as to cost of construction.

"Q. A lot of these items on their face do not appear to be items that went into the construction of the road, how is that? A. They may have gone into the operation of the road, we were operating the railway."

It would be impossible to accept Colonel Wurtele's evidence as proving the fact that these two particular items went into the construction of the railway. Other evidence would be required before I would be willing to accept those two sums of $500,000 and $794,869.50 as having been expended in the construction of this 21 miles of railway.

Further, he draws attention to the evidence given by Colonel Wurtele as to the cost of the railway. Colonel Wurtele said that it cost $92,000 a mile. It is proved by documents filed in the case that the cost of construction of a little extension of that railway a few years later, built with about the same material, when the cost of construction was higher, did not amount to more than $14,000 or $15,000 a mile.

Mr. REID: The hon. member is talking about the Quebec and Montmorency railway now?

Mr. LEMIEUX: Yes. The judge makes these remarks about the striking evidence of Colonel Wurtele as to the cost of construction:

I may call the attention of counsel to the fact that in the trust deed, schedule "D," at page 19, there is the estimate of cost of constructing certain extensions. The total is 11 miles—and the total estimate is $149,947, which would be under $14,000 a mile—and while of course the main railway previously built may not have been built at that low figure, the contrast between the two figures, namely, $92,500 a mile and the $14,000 a mile, is striking.

And it is striking, indeed. Proceeding with the Quebec and Saguenay, the judge says:

To my mind to allow these charges for obtaining money—

because they charged a large amount of money for the issue of bonds and for the borrowing of money—

—and the interest for a period of years might make the matter almost farcical. The railway might have laid dormant for a period of another twenty years. Meanwhile the interest on the bonds would have to be paid amounting to two or three million dollars, all of which, assuming the company paid the interest, would be charged up in their books to the shareholders, and if the argument put forward is correct in that case, the Crown when paying what is defined by the statute to be the actual cost of the railways, would be paying some three million dollars odd for interest, for which no value is given in return.

and the judge very naturally says, in concluding his reasons for the judgment:

It will be easy when the case is concluded, to arrive at the amount which, in my judgment, ought to be allowed. There will have to be deducted the allowance for depreciation, which has been settled. There will also have to be deducted the amounts received from the Dominion and provincial subsidies. These sums are not in dispute. There will also have to be deducted these items that I have just been referring to in connection with the Saguenay railway, and any amounts that should be deducted from the Montmorency and Charlevoix railway and the Megantic railway on a proper valuation being proved.

Mr. TAYLOR: Will the hon. gentleman permit a question with reference to the sum for interest of which he has just been speaking? Was that sum based upon money borrowed during the construction period of the railway?

Mr. LEMIEUX: No. In the first place, the railway has not been constructed.

Mr. TAYLOR: There is some construction.

Mr. LEMIEUX: I spend the summer at Murray Bay, and I know whereof I speak.

[Mr. J. D. Reid.]

The railway has not been constructed. There are no rails, there are no ties—nothing except the roadbed partly finished. Some years ago the company was exploiting another company, known as the Nairn Falls Pulp Company, at Nairn Falls. In order to exploit the pulp proposition to advantage, it built the terminus of the railway, starting from Murray Bay wharf to Nairn Falls, about seven miles. No passengers are carried. The road was only built to transport pulp from the mills of the Nairn Falls Pulp Company to Murray Bay wharf.

Mr. SEVIGNY: The Eastern Canada Pulp Company.

Mr. LEMIEUX: The Eastern Canada Pulp Company. It is an outside enterprise altogether, and has nothing to do with the railway. Nothing has been constructed.

Mr. CARVELL: What about the road from Nairn Falls westward? How much of the link has not been constructed?

Mr. LEMIEUX: There are no rails, and no ties.

Mr. REID: If my hon. friend would put it fairly, I think he would say the roadbed has been constructed, and is practically ready for laying the rails. In other words, if they had the rails ready to lay it would probably only take a month or two until they could be running trains right through to Murray Bay.

Mr. LEMIEUX: In all sincerity, I must say my hon. friend is entirely at sea. The Minister of Railways and Canals will tell him that this year, in order to maintain what little work had been done on the roadbed, he has been obliged to take, illegally in my judgment, $400,000 from the amount voted last year. He will remember that that amount was voted with a qualification.

Mr. NESBITT: Three hundred and thirty-five thousand dollars.

Mr. LEMIEUX: My hon. friend stated the other day that it was a revote from last year. The vote last year was for $4,000,000, and the difference between the two votes was spent on construction last year. They were trying to protect the road and putting in stone to prevent the current from washing out the ballast. Formerly a quantity of timber and other material was put in the sides for that purpose. The Minister of Inland Revenue and the Secretary of State visited the district last year and went over the road. They can tell

us that there is practically no work done. True, there is a little roadbed, but it has been partially destroyed. The Minister of Railways took this amount of money out of the vote of $4,000,000 last year to do some cement work to protect what little had been done. In my judgment, he took this amount illegally. I was just going to say to my hon. friend that the Government has decided to buy that property, whatever there is to be purchased, and to construct the road——

Mr. SEVIGNY: I think the roadbed is practically complete between St. Joachim and Murray Bay, and if my information is correct over two million dollars was spent by the Quebec and Saguenay between those two points.

Mr. LEMIEUX: I may tell my hon. friend that the so-called roadbed was built at a small cost. The company had no money, and in order to get money they issued bonds, and they had to pay twice the amount in order to satisfy Mr. O'Brien, the contractor. It never cost $2,000,0000. Whatever was done had to be protected this year by the Minister of Railways and Canals, and I call his attention to the fact that he took that money out of the vote of last year, and in my judgment he could not spend one red cent out of that vote because it was conditional. The item in the appropriation made last year read as follows:

To provide amount required to be paid for the Quebec, Montmorency, and Charlevoix Railway, the Quebec and Saguenay Railway, and the Lotbiniere and Megantic Railway, and for the equipment, appurtenances and property used in connection with such railways, to be acquired under the authority of a statute passed at the present session, and to provide for the cost of completing, equipping, and operating the said railways, the operating expenses to be chargeable to revenue.

The statute enacts that the Exchequer Court shall fix the value, and the railways, of course could not be acquired until the Exchequer Court had passed on the actual cost. Therefore, any money spent by my hon. friend was illegally spent. I suppose he meant well when he did it, but nevertheless it was illegal. When this question came up last year, my hon. friend from Kingston (Mr. Nickle) used the following language, which applies this year as it applied last year.

But this I do want to say: in a time when the Empire is at war, when every dollar that Canada can raise is required for the legitimate purposes of the war—and as to this I have been deeply impressed by the speeches that the Minister of Finance has delivered in this House and elsewhere—I cannot bring myself to add anything to the burdens of the people of this country. If these were ordinary times I might not feel so strongly on the question, but being influenced by the judgment of the Minister of Finance—and I have great respect for his judgment—and realizing that a commission is about to be appointed to consider the whole railway problem in Canada. I cannot see my way clear to voting for the continuance of this amount in the Estimates.

The conditions to-day are the same as they were last year. We are at war spending large amounts to maintain our status at the front. We are taxed right and left. We are piling up a public debt which is simply appalling. We are borrowing at usurious rates of interest in the foreign markets, and this is no time to spend lavishly on a scheme which is simply nauseating. Every one who knows the origin of this scheme knows that it is nauseating. But, we discussed this matter last year when it came before the House.

I want to make a proposition to the Minister of Railways, and I think it is a fair one. The Lotbiniere and Megantic is a little bit of a road on the south shore of the river St. Lawrence in the counties of Megantic and Lotbiniere. It is a lumbering road. It has no relation whatsoever with the Quebec and Montmorency. It is several miles on the other side of the river and making towards Sherbrooke. It was intended to reach the United States boundary originally.

Mr. McKENZIE: Who owned the road when the Government bought it?

Mr. LEMIEUX: It belonged to the same group of gentlemen. They launched an immense scheme on the European market. They advertised that scheme as being a semi-transcontinental railway. The road was to start at the United States boundary, cross the river St. Lawrence by the Quebec bridge, link up with the Quebec and Montmorency, which was a tramway originally designed to carry pilgrims to and from St. Anne's, and the Quebec and Saguenay railway, which, first of all, was to run to Nairn Falls, and which, it was afterwards announced, was to go as far as Cape Charles on the Labrador coast. That is how it was advertised in the very alluring prospectuses which were issued, and which captured the money of the innocent French investors on the other side of the Atlantic. But the Lotbiniere and Megantic had nothing to do with the Quebec and Montmorency and the Quebec and Saguenay. Let my hon. friend do away with that bit of railway. It is merely a lumbering road.

The people have never petitioned the Government to make it a government-owned railway. Then the Quebec and Montmorency is a paying proposition. It gives a good net income to the Quebec and Montmorency people. It is a system by itself The object of that road is to carry people from Quebec, and from different points in the province, to the famous shrine of Ste. Anne de Beaupré. There is no reason why, at the present moment, the Government should acquire that road. Leave it to the Quebec and Montmorency Company. I admit that the people of Charlevoix are in need of transportation and that they are entitled, as are other parts of the country, to a railway, although the Government spend a large amount of money every year for the maintenance of a ferry across the St. Lawrence from River Ouelle to St. Irénée, Murray Bay, and Cap à l'Aigle, on the north shore, the ferry being operated in connection with the Intercolonial railway. This ferry is a credit to the department, and the train service, in the summer time especially when there are so many tourists, is excellent. I pay my compliments to the minister for that. If the Government will limit their acquisitive powers to the Quebec and Saguenay I have no objection, provided they follow the line of the judgment of Sir Walter Cassels and provided they press the sponge and squeeze out all the water that there is in that enterprise. The judgment is there. The policy is laid down by Sir Walter Cassels. He has heard the evidence and at one fell swoop he has discarded a very large amount from the claim which was made by the railway promoters. I believe I have explained to the committee exactly what the situation is. My hon. friend has spent $400,000 out of that vote of last year, but I contend he has done it illegally, because the amount voted last year was voted with a qualification, namely, that before acquiring the railway the department should get from the Exchequer Court its actual value. The judgment is not final, but we have from the judge an expression of opinion which reduces very materially the amount which is claimed by the company. The company has not appealed. The words used by Sir Walter Cassels are as follows:

> Since the conclusion of the hearing of these cases, I have carefully perused the evidence and exhibits produced before me, and I have also considered the questions to be determined. I think as the questions to be determined depend to such an extent upon the construction to be placed upon the statute as to the method by which the amounts payable are to be ascertained, and as the differences are so large between the method of valuation claimed by the railway companies, and the views I entertain, it may be better before any further evidence is taken, that an appeal, if such is proposed, (assuming the right of appeal exists) should be taken to the Supreme Court, in order that I may be set right, if I have taken an erroneous view.

No appeal has been lodged and I claim that not a cent can be spent until we have a final judgment in this matter.

Mr. REID: The Quebec and Montmorency road has been constructed for many years. The hon. member has stated that it is a paying road. It is a paying road, the railway returns show that. Were this transaction to go through, by the statements of the hon. member himself the Government would be acquiring a road that was a paying road, the Quebec and Montmorency. The Quebec and Saguenay road is practically completed except for the laying of the rails, and that road the hon. member has also said should be built as the people along the north shore are entitled to it.

Mr. LEMIEUX: Do not stretch it too far.

Mr. REID: I am speaking of what the hon. member has said.

Mr. McKENZIE: Has the department any report by any of its engineers as to the condition of the road? We would prefer a report from an engineer.

Mr. REID: I will come to that in a moment. The hon. member says that the amount spent last year on this road was spent illegally by the Minister of Railways. Let me say that on any payment by any department there is a double check. The Department of Justice must give a ruling that the moneys can be paid and the Auditor General must consent to their payment. Both the department and the Auditor General have passed this, so it has been done legally in the opinion of those two departments.

The policy of purchasing these roads was settled last year, and need not be discussed now. It was explained by the Secretary of State (Mr. Meighen) that the Government had protected itself in every way in respect to the purchase money being in accordance with the understanding, and it was left to the judge of the Exchequer court to fix the amount. The hon. member has laid great stress on the fact that the solicitor for the Government agreed to two amounts, one of $500,000 and the other of $789,000, and one would conclude from his remarks that in his opinion the solicitor who is acting for the Government either

was doing that on account of his not having sufficient ability to give the necessary attention to the matter, or else that he had some motive in agreeing to those two amounts. The solicitor was Mr. Meredith, of Montreal.

Mr. LEMIEUX: And Mr. Bernier, of Quebec.

Mr. REID: The admission was made by Mr. Meredith, the eminent counsel of Montreal, and he made it on his own responsibility and without any interference or suggestion from the Government. Mr. Meredith is one of the leading counsel in Montreal, and I do not think that the slightest reflection should be cast on him in connection with this or any other case. The Quebec and Montmorency is the road that has been built for many years and that is a good paying road.

Mr. MACDONALD: Then why do the owners not keep it if it is a paying concern?

Mr. REID: I will answer that point in a moment. This was protected by the judge of the Exchequer Court being directed to determine the value.

Mr. MACDONALD: Why do you help him to determine the value?

Mr. LEMIEUX: I wish to say that whatever I said about counsel for the Government should not be taken as a reflection on Mr. Meredith or Mr. Alphonse Bernier. I simply quoted Mr. Justice Cassels. But the fact remains that the judge rejected two big items that they were ready to accept.

Mr. REID: There seems to be an insinuation that Mr. Meredith had some kind of hint or reason for deducting that amount.

Mr. LEMIEUX: I hope my hon. friend did not think I would be guilty of casting a reflection on Mr. Meredith.

Mr. REID: There were reasons for differences of opinion. I have not read any thing since the debate of last session. But, if I remember correctly, in that agreement or Bill of last year we inserted the provision that in purchasing each of these roads we would do so at the actual cost.

Mr. LEMIEUX: Yes.

Mr. REID: The word " actual " was put in, and there is a possibility that the judge of the Exchequer Court, in determining the value of the Quebec and Montmorency road, took into consideration the actual cost of the road when it was originally built. These items—I am only saying that this may be a possibility—may have been for construction since that time, and the judge could not allow them on account of the word "actual" having been put in the agreement.

Mr. CARVELL: The hon. gentleman has not read the judgment.

Mr. REID: I admit I have not read it. The hon. member for Pictou (Mr. Macdonald) has said: " Why do not the owners want to keep this road?" So far as these gentlemen are concerned, they want to keep it. The hon. gentleman made the suggestion that if the Government would let the parties keep the Quebec and Montmorency, and the Megantic and Lotbiniere roads, he would not object to the Government taking over the Quebec and Saguenay.

Mr. MACDONALD: I never said anything of the kind.

Mr. REID: I am speaking of the hon. member for Rouville (Mr. Lemieux). The Minister of Railways and Canals made an arrangement with these owners to take over the Quebec and Saguenay roads, and if the Bill had been brought in as was intended this session, it would have provided only for the taking over of the Quebec and Saguenay, with running rights over the other roads. These owners were going to keep those two pieces of road, and they were only too willing to keep the Quebec and Montmorency. I have the feeling that the hon. gentleman knew exactly what these parties intended to ask for, and what had been arranged when he made that suggestion a few minutes ago. He knew that was going to be done, and he is willing to-night to agree that the part that he knew paid very well, which made $100,000 last year, and has paid every year, should be abandoned. If the Bill had been introduced as intended it would have eliminated from the agreement of last year these two roads, just as the hon. gentleman suggested, and running rights would have been obtained over these roads that he knew paid so well. That would have been carrying, out exactly the hon. gentleman's suggestion. So far as the judgment of the judge of the Exchequer Court goes, the Minister of Railways has stated that the Government will stand by that judgment, and nothing else; in fact, it cannot do otherwise. The hon. gentleman from Rouville is a lawyer of suffi-

cient ability and standing to know that we cannot under the Act of last year take over the Quebec and Saguenay alone. This item is a revote for the purposes of that Act. So far as the condition of the road is concerned, the hon. gentleman had the report last year on that subject. If I remember rightly, about 80 per cent of the roadbed had been completed. The work of this year to put the road into proper shape and in running order was carried on under the supervision of Mr. Gordon Grant, Chief Engineer of the Transcontinental Railway. Every dollar of this three hundred and some odd thousand has been spent under the supervision of Mr. Grant, and he told me, I should think some two or three months ago, that the road bed was practically completed clear through to Murray Bay. There were a few bridges which had to be completed; they were under contract, and if we could get the rails we would have the trains running through to Murray Bay during the present season. But, being unable to get the rails, they could not possibly complete it.

Mr. MACDONALD: Are you doing that to win the war?

Mr. REID: We are doing that right now. And I say to the hon. gentleman that if we had brought in a Bill to change the present condition, it would have been to eliminate the other two roads and to take the Quebec and Saguenay alone. And that I understand, would have been satisfactory to the hon. gentleman. No conditions can be changed until an Act of Parliament has been passed. Referring to the point raised as to the money being spent illegally, I say that the Minister of Railways and Canals did it on the advice of the Minister of Justice, and with the consent of the Auditor General; and it was done with the object of getting the road completed at the earliest possible moment, so that the people would have the benefit of it. The Government were protected in the matter, because they would not pay one dollar of the purchase money until the judge of the Exchequer Court had given his judgment, which, of course, would be final and to the satisfaction of the Justice Department and of this House.

Mr. MACDONALD: If I wanted to get an apologist for a rotten, miserable, weak case, that nobody could be found to defend, I would go to my hon. friend the Minister of Customs. It is true he has not been admitted to the bar, but I have seen him perform so often in this House, and in the committees of the House, within the last ten or fifteen years, that I really take off my hat to him as a member of the bar for ability in dodging, twisting, turning and scheming in the endeavour to put up a case when there was no case. He is an artist along those lines. I really do not think he has his proper place in the Administration. He would make a far better Minister of Justice than the gentleman who now occupies that position, because there are so many things that are laid to the door of this Government, things of which the country knows them to be guilty, and which none can defend with the same ease and grace as the hon. Minister of Customs. He would do far better than the Minister of Justice (Mr. Doherty), with his laboured, prolonged and strained utterances that nobody ever cares to follow and that nobody ever understands when they do follow them. My hon. friend has told us, with his tortuous windings, that it is a good thing for this country to-day that the Government should take $3,667,745.07 out of the moneys that have been wrung from the people by direct taxation upon incomes and by various other methods that the Government have devised under the guise of winning the war and paying for war expenses, and hand it over to Rodolphe Forget for the purpose of enabling him to speculate in the stock of the Quebec and Saguenay. That is the true situation, no matter how the minister may sidestep or talk all around it.

Mr. LEMIEUX: Sir Rodolphe Forget.

Mr. MACDONALD: I beg the hon. gentleman's pardon. Titles are so numerous these days that one forgets to give these gentlemen who have acquired them the full name to which they are entitled.

Mr. CARVELL: The Government ought to tax them $10,000 apiece.

Mr. MACDONALD: My hon. friend from Carleton makes a good suggestion. We have found out that hon. gentlemen can get titles just the same as gentlemen can get titles in England, merely by buying them. That is one of the flatulent, silly, ridiculous things that hon. gentlemen opposite are perpetuating in this country for the purpose of patriotic performances under their Administration.

Mr. COCHRANE: Did Lord Shaughnessy buy his title?

Mr. MACDONALD: I do not know anything about Lord Shaughnessy. He is a good friend of the minister's. It was my

hon. friend and his friends that interested themselves in making him a peer.

Mr. COCHRANE: I just wanted to know if you accused him of buying his title.

Mr. MACDONALD: The minister knows whether he paid for it or not, and if he paid for it, the minister should tell us. There are some other gentlemen who have got titles under this Administration, and if the minister will give us the story of how they acquired them, I will sit down and let him tell us.

Mr. COCHRANE: I asked you a civil question. You made a statement, and I want you to back it up.

Mr. MACDONALD: The minister is one of the gentlemen who advise His Majesty as to the giving of titles, and he knows whether the gentleman paid for it or not. I do not know. If the minister knows whether he paid for it or not, he should tell us.

Mr. COCHRANE: You made an accusation, and I want you to back it up.

Mr. MACDONALD: The minister knows whether I am right or not. The minister is not denying my statement; he is asking me a question about somebody about whom I know nothing.

Mr. COCHRANE: You made a broad statement; you said that they buy titles. I ask you if Lord Shaughnessy bought his.

Mr. MACDONALD: What about the other people?

Mr. COCHRANE: I am only asking about one. You made a broad statement.

Mr. CARVELL: Are titles for sale?

Mr. MACDONALD: My hon. friend suggests that they are for sale. How much are they worth?

Mr. COCHRANE: I do not know. You made the statement. Be either a man or a mouse. Back up your statements.

Mr. MACDONALD: The Minister of Railways does not belong to the committee of council which has to do with the sale of titles. If he did, he would know all about the matter. Consequently he is asking me a question concerning which some of his colleagues, if he asked them, could tell him much more than I could.

Mr. COCHRANE: Do not make the statement if you cannot back it up.

Mr. MACDONALD: I was not referring to Lord Shaughnessy, who is well worthy of distinction. The minister knows to whom I refer.

Mr. DAVIDSON: What about honorary colonelcies?

Mr. MACDONALD: My hon. friend speaks about honorary colonelcies. So far as I am concerned, I was appointed an honorary colonel by the late administration on the recommendation of all the officers of the 78th Regiment of my county who passed a resolution requesting that I should be made one. I never asked for it, and I am not particular whether the hon. gentleman's Government who promoted me to be an honorary colonel take the whole thing away from me to-morrow. My hon. friend can ask the Minister of Militia to cancel my appointment. I shall have no regret.

The CHAIRMAN (Mr. Dugald Stewart): Will the hon. member come back to the question under discussion?

Mr. MACDONALD: I will do so if my hon. friend from Annapolis (Mr. Davidson) will refrain from asking me questions.

The CHAIRMAN: He has already been answered.

Mr. MACDONALD: Will you, Sir, restrain the minister and the hon. member from Annapolis?

Mr. DAVIDSON: Does the hon. member think that regiment would make such a recommendation now?

The CHAIRMAN: Order.

Mr. MACDONALD: If you, Sir, will keep the Minister of Railways and the hon. member from Annapolis in order, I will come back to the question under discussion. I have been diverted by these hon. gentlemen who have been asking me questions which I have been endeavouring to answer. Nobody knows better than the Minister of Customs that the reason for Canada acquiring those three railways in war time is so grotesque that you cannot state a more grotesque proposition at any time, let alone in war time. I can fancy that certain hon. gentlemen who support the minister, for instance the Minister of Inland Revenue (Mr. Sévigny), would be willing to get the Quebec, Montmorency and Charlevoix made a Government railway so that his confreres could go down to Ste. Anne de Beaupré and visit the shrine there and get cured.

Mr. SEVIGNY: It would be a very good thing for the hon. member to go down to Ste. Anne de Beaupré.

Mr. MACDONALD: I happen to worship at a Presbyterian shrine and not at the shrine of Ste. Anne de Beaupré.

Mr. REID: Does the hon. member belong to my church?

Mr. MACDONALD: I do not know how some of my hon. friend's confreres from Quebec who are so terribly anti-French these days—

Mr. SEVIGNY: I do not think they are worse than the hon. member for Pictou.

Mr. MACDONALD: The minister does not know my mentality.

Mr. SEVIGNY: I know it.

Mr. MACDONALD: The minister knows that my ancestors and all my people and myself have been associates of the French race for three or four generations and we have no antipathy against them. He has associates behind him and men who support him, men who, I am surprised, would support a proposition that the Government of Canada should own and operate a railway for the purpose of carrying people to the shrine of Ste. Anne de Beaupré. That is the only part of the railway which the Minister of Customs undertook to defend as being a commercial proposition. He said that part of the railway paid.

Mr. REID: It was the hon. member for Rouville who said that.

Mr. MACDONALD: My hon. friend defended that proposition. He did not say anything about the Lotbinière and Megantic or the Quebec and Saguenay. What I say is this: This whole proposition is a disgraceful perversion of public money in war time for the purpose of satisfying a political supporter from the province of Quebec. When you are taxing the people by the various methods adopted by this Government, when the Minister of Finance is speaking about economy, to divert this money for this purpose is absolutely defenceless.

11 p.m.

Mr. NICKLE: Last year when this question was before the House, I differed from my confreres on this side of the House as to the wisdom of the vote. The few remarks that I am now about to offer, let me assure the committee, shall not deal with my ancestors, nor the antagonism of any hon. member from Ontario to the province of Quebec. This is purely a business proposition, and surely it is possible to approach it as such without endeavouring to stir up either political or religious animosities. I think I know those parts of the country in which those railways are situated fairly well, and I know something about their history. I can appreciate the desire that the people have that they should have railway communication like people in the other parts of the country more favourably situated. I am not altogether blind to the fact that since the French settled on the northern bank of the St. Lawrence the winters have always been found tiresomely long, and the people have been more or less driven into isolation. If we were not at war, although the expenditure might be extravagant, I think I would be prepared to vote for the purchasing of those railways in the hope that they might give those people more adequate railway facilities. But, unfortunately, the country is at war, and our national resources are being taxed to their utmost, and, in my judgment ,the financial resources of this country are going to be taxed more in the future than they have been in the past.

Only a year or two ago Lloyd George said that this war would be won as much by the "silver bullet" as by any other means. If that was true two years ago, it is obvious to us and to the world at large that it is equally true to-day. Putting that idea into commonplace expression, it simply means that that nation is likely to win the war which can stand the financial strain the longest and make the best resistance to the inroads on its financial standing. What is the standing of this country to-day? We started out borrowing $100,000,000 and $150,000,000. as the case might be, at a rate in the neighbourhood of 5½ per cent. The next loan did not sell quite so well. Lately we borrowed a few millions in New York at a cost of 6 or 7 per cent. If we are to believe what we see in the papers to-day—I speak only from that information—the next loan of $100,000,000 will likely cost us 6 per cent. In other words, money is getting dearer; it is getting harder to get the money that is necessary to carry on the war. No one who has watched the situation can be blind to the fact that England's financial resources are being strained, and that we in Canada are being called upon to bear part of the burden that England would otherwise bear. Under these circumstances we are asked to spend $4,000,000 in the purchase of what I consider to be unnecessary railways at this time. When last year I saw the confusion that arose in the arbitration before Mr. Justice Cassels, I rather hoped that we had heard the last

of this railway problem. The arbitration terms, as set out in chapter 22 of 6 and 7 George V, lay this down:

> Said value to be the actual cost of said railways, less subsidies and less depreciation.

When that Act was introduced into the House last year I thought that the dice were pretty well loaded against the country. The cost was to be the amount that it had cost the railway companies to construct, regardless of whether or not consideration had been given to economy. This country was to pay for these three railroads the amount of money that had been put into their construction, less depreciation and less subsidies. I certainly thought that the owners of the railroad would grasp with avidity what was offered to them, but I was amazed, when I read the proceedings before the arbitrator, to learn that the solicitors for the owners set up that they were entitled to interest on the moneys invested, not only during the time of construction, but also during all the time that the railway had lain idle—because it had never been carried to completion. That seems to me to be an extraordinary contention, but I thought, as they had set it up, that probably we had heard the last of the question. However, here we are to-night confronted with another vote. We are asked to vote $4,000,000 of the people's money to buy what I consider at the present time to be three unnecessary railroads. If some hon. gentleman opposite moves that this item be struck out, I shall, as I did a year ago, support the motion for the elimination of the item. I quite realize, after six years of parliamentary experience, that when an item of this kind is inserted in the estimates it is not very likely to be deleted. The Government put it there, and a majority of their followers will keep it there. But I direct the attention of the committee to this fact: I believe the time is coming—it may not be as far off as some of us think—when this nation may become war-weary. The people may become a bit weary of making sacrifices for this war, and if they do, it is purchases of this kind that will have helped to make them war-weary. If I judge aright the spirit of the Canadian people to-day, it is this: we are willing to sacrifice to the limit, but we want our Government to practice the same thrift, the same economy, that they ask us to practice. If the Government will give the example, I believe the people will follow; but it is the duty of the Government to give the example if they want the people to follow.

Mr. NESBITT: Last year when this vote of $4,000,000 was up, I took the liberty of moving that it be struck out. I thought it a great pity to use the people's money during the war to buy these three little railways, the purchases of which, to my mind, could not possibly be of any benefit to the people. The hon. member for Pictou (Mr. Macdonald) says that the vote is being taken in order to purchase these railways for the relief of Sir Rodolphe Forget. I do not know whether or not that is true; I am not going to say that it is. But I do say just what the member for Kingston said: the nation that can stand out the longest will probably win this war. We have to do our share, and so far as I know, every man and woman in the country is willing to do his or her share towards the payment of the legitimate expenses of the country. But the Government should set the example. They lecture us—quite properly on the saving of food, and on the exercise of economy; but they do not set the example themselves. Last night we passed some votes that should not have been passed. To-night the Government ask us to pass this ridiculous vote of nearly $4,000,000. I agree with the member for Rouville (Mr. Lemieux) that the money that was spent this year on this road should not have been spent. The Minister of Customs may be right in saying that legally the Government was within its rights in spending the money, but morally they had no right to do so until the Exchequer Court's judgment had been received and the road had been taken over. They had no right to spend any money on the road until they owned it, and certainly they do not own it yet, because the judgment of the Exchequer Court has not been accepted by the present owners. From a business standpoint, therefore, the Government should not have spent one dollar on that road, whether they were legally entitled to do so or not. However, they have spent the money. I have the greatest possible regard for the Minister of Railways, and I am surprised—because I have faith in his business judgment—that he should have been induced to spend money on this road before it was properly taken over. The fact that the company have not accepted the judgment of the Exchequer Court gives the Government a good excuse for not going any further and I think we should make that a reason for not voting money to-night for the purchase of this railway. We cannot afford to make any unnecessary expenditures.

As representatives of the people we should set an example to them of economy, but we are not doing that by any means in the votes that we are putting through. I hope the minister will apply his business sense and his good judgment to this matter and that he will agree not to press this vote. I move that the item be struck out.

Mr. PROULX: How much more does the Government intend to pay than the amount fixed by the Exchequer Court?

Mr. REID: The intention of the Government is to take only the Quebec and Saguenay road. There is no intention of taking the other two.

Mr. McKENZIE: How can the minister say that, with the statute of last year confronting him?

Mr. REID: The intention of the Bill passed last year was to take over the three roads. The judge of Exchequer Court, however, has refused to accept two items of $500,000 and $700,000 odd, claimed in respect of the Quebec and Montmorency. That is the road which is completed. But the owners of the road do not want to accept the judgment.

Mr. McKENZIE: This will go through, or it will all fall through.

Mr. REID: We would not go on only on the understanding that we would take the Quebec and Saguenay alone. The reason why the amount has been fixed, as I understand it, as to the value of the Quebec and Saguenay—I think the hon. member stated the judgment of the Exchequer Court was that the Quebec and Saguenay was valued at a certain amount.

Mr. McKENZIE: It did not fix anything.

Mr. LEMIEUX: The judgment deducted large amounts, but did not fix any value.

Mr. REID: As I understand it, if we wanted to take the Quebec and Saguenay alone, we could not do it under that Act, because the Bill provided for the taking of the three, and the Government will not take the three, but only the Quebec and Saguenay.

Mr. NESBITT: What authority have they for that?

Mr. REID: We are leaving it in the same position; we are leaving it to the new Parliament to decide. We cannot take any action under this Act because it provides for acquiring the three roads.

Mr. McKENZIE: Then, this item should not be before the Committee.

[Mr. Nesbitt.]

Mr. REID: Yes, it should, and I will tell you why. When this Act was passed, there was an agreement made to take it over in accordance with the Act. Then the Government went on to complete the road and get it ready for operation, and $332,000 has been expended on it. I do not think there is any other way that it can be done except to leave the amount as it is.

Mr. CARVELL: I think the statement of the minister brings this matter up in such a way that I could not allow it to go by unchallenged, although up to the present time I had not intended speaking upon it. I was not in the House to any extent last year when this matter went through, as I was engaged elsewhere, and I have never given the matter any personal consideration. I have always made it a point not to discuss questions of this kind unless I have had an opportunity of studying them pretty carefully. During the last half hour I have gone over the statute, and over the judgment of Mr. Justice Cassels, and I do not see how in the world the minister can pretend to take over one portion of the railway, and not take them all.

Mr. REID: That is what I said, I think.

Mr. CARVELL: Then, surely the item should be dropped. Let me point out the statute under which the minister is acting. I will not go into the reasons which actuated the Government. I do not believe sufficient reasons were given for the passing of the statute. Although I was not here, I have a general knowledge of what was going on, and it certainly is something that does not reflect credit upon the business judgment of the Government, and I know it does not appeal to the business judgment of the Minister of Railways. I am like my friend beside me (Mr. Lemieux)—and I am not saying this to throw bouquets at the Minister of Railways—but I do consider he is a good, straight business man.

Mr. LEMIEUX: Hear, hear.

Mr. CARVELL: And I know he must abhor any such conduct as has been carried on. However, we have to take the matter as it is. The statute provides:

1. The Governor in Council may authorize and empower the Minister of Railways and Canals to acquire, under the provisions of an Act to amend the Government Railways Act, and to authorize the purchase of certain railways, chapter 16 of the Statutes of 1915, and upon such terms and conditions as the Governor in Council may approve, the railways described in the schedule hereto, together with such equipment, appurtenances, and properties used in connection with such railways as

the Governor in Council may deem necessary for the operation thereof.

Not to buy one railway, but to buy all the railways mentioned in the schedule, which provides for the purchase of the three lines. Section 2 says:

2. The consideration to be paid for each of the said railways, and for any equipment, appurtenances and properties that may be acquired as aforesaid, shall be the value thereof as determined by the Exchequer Court of Canada; said value to be the actual cost of said railways, less subsidies and less depreciation, but not to exceed four million three hundred and forty-nine thousand dollars, exclusive of outstanding bonded indebtedness, which is to be assumed by the Government, but not to exceed in all two million five hundred thousand dollars.

They were treated there as one entity, and I see from the judgment of Mr. Justice Cassels that there was an agreement prior to that by which these three railways were brought under one railway company, and we know that to be true. I think that company was called the Quebec Railway Company. The stock was listed upon the market.

Mr. REID: It is the Quebec Light, Heat and Power Company.

Mr. CARVELL: It is referred to in the newspapers and on the stock market as the Quebec railway. We know the stock was selling as low as 10, or 11, or 12, or 13, and the moment this legislation was passed it commenced to soar, and went up to 40 or 45, I think.

Mr. REID: I do not think it ever went as high as that.

Mr. CARVELL: It went up somewhere in the thirties, in any event. After the judgment of Mr. Justice Cassels, it started to come down again. Considering the financial condition as pointed out so forcibly by my hon. friend from Kingston (Mr. Nickle), it seems to me, before we pass this item we ought to have a pretty thorough discussion of the facts as they are. Notwithstanding the very late hour, I am going to take the responsibility of placing on Hansard a portion of the judgment of Mr. Justice Cassels. I admit that I did not read it myself until this evening, and I doubt very much if many of the members of the House have read it. It does not require a lawyer to appreciate this judgment. A perusal of it must lead an ordinary man to the conclusion that the Government is not justified in forcing this thing through unless they are going to start out on an entirely new proposition—disregard the legislation of 1916; disregard the investigation which has been made into the cost of the road; disregard the judgment of Mr. Justice Cassels; disregard everything they have done, and say: In the face of all these things we are going to come to the rescue of our political friend, Sir Rodolphe Forget, and are going to give him three or four million dollars simply as a present. I appreciate the necessity of railway communication on the north shore of the St. Lawrence just as well as any member in this House does, and I agree with my hon. friend from Kingston that were it under conditions other than those existing at the present time it might be considered. We must remember that after this Act was passed by which the railway was to be paid for according to the actual cost as found by the Exchequer Court, a long and expensive investigation was held, at which a large amount of evidence was taken. I have not read the evidence, but it is referred to in the judgment. Upon that evidence, Mr. Justice Cassels delivered a judgment on January 24 last. If the committee will pardon me I will read a portion of this judgment, in order that it may appear in Hansard, because I think the people of Canada should have an opportunity of reading it for themselves and forming their own conclusions as to whether or not this Government is justified in the course they are attempting to pursue. The judgment says:

Since the conclusion of the hearing of these cases, I have carefully perused the evidence and exhibits produced before me, and have also considered the questions to be determined. I think as the questions to be determined depend to such an extent upon the construction to be placed upon the statute as to the method by which the amounts payable are to be ascertained, and as the differences are so large between the method of valuation claimed by the railway companies and the views I entertain, it may be better before any further evidence is taken, that an appeal, if such is proposed (assuming the right of appeal exists), should be taken to the Supreme Court, in order that I may be set right, if I have taken an erroneous view.

I may say that I have given the matter a great deal of thought, and I must express my thanks to the counsel for all parties for the great assistance they have afforded me. The statute pursuant to which the matters come before the Exchequer Court of Canada, is Cap. 22, 6-7 Geo. V, assented to on the 18th May, 1916. This statute provides that the Governor in Council may authorize and empower the Minister of Railways and Canals to acquire upon such terms and conditions as the Governor in Council may approve, the railways described

in the schedule hereto, together with such equipment, appurtenances and properties used in connection with such railways, as the Governor in Council may deem necessary for the operation thereof.

There are three railways mentioned in the schedule:

(a) The line of railway commonly known as the Quebec, Montmorency and Charlevoix railway, extending from St. Paul street in the city of Quebec to St. Joachim a distance of about 43½ miles;

(b) The Quebec and Saguenay railway, extending from its junction with the Quebec, Montmorency and Charlevoix railway at St. Joachim in the county of Montmorency to Nairn Falls, in the county of Charlevoix a distance of about 62 8/10 miles; and

(c) The Lotbiniere and Megantic railway, extending from Lyster in the county of Megantic to St. Jean des Chaillons in the county of Lotbiniere, a distance of about thirty miles.

The second section provides as follows:

"The consideration to be paid for each of the said railways and for any equipment, appurtenances and properties that may be acquired as aforesaid shall be the value thereof as determined by the Exchequer Court of Canada; said value to be the actual cost of said railways, less subsidies and less depreciation, but not to exceed four million, three hundred and forty-nine thousand dollars, exclusive of outstanding bonded indebtedness which is to be assumed by the Government, but not to exceed in all two million, five hundred thousand dollars."

It is agreed by counsel for the railways and for the Crown, that the maximum consideration of $4,349,000 and $2,500,000 is the maximum price to be paid for the three railways. Pursuant to the statute, an agreement was entered into between the Crown and the Saguenay company, the Quebec Railway, Light and Power company, the Lotbiniere and Megantic railway company, and the Quebec Railway, Light, Heat and Power Company. The different railways are referred to throughout the agreement, one as the "Saguenay Company"—two, "the Quebec Railway Company"—three, the "Megantic Railway Company" and, four, "The Quebec Power Company."

The railway referred to as (a) in the schedule to the statute, and commonly known as the Quebec, Montmorency and Charlevoix railway, is what is referred to as "The Quebec Railway Company" in the agreement in question. The name was changed by statute.

You will see that these three separate railways were brought together by the agreement entered into between the respective companies. The agreement brought them all under one control and management and they were treated as one entity in the legislation passed a year ago. When the Government started out to purchase these railways they bought them as one whole and not as three portions. When the minister talks about separating them, saying that they are going to abandon two and purchase the third, I contend that they have no jurisdiction to do that. They may have jurisdiction under some other statute, under the statute of 1915, but they have no jurisdiction under the statute of 1916 to do that, because they only have the right to buy the three railways at a valuation to be fixed by a judge of the Exchequer Court.

Mr. MORPHY: I think the words of the statute were that the Government "may" buy the three. If that is so it covers them all and they may buy one.

Mr. CARVELL: The word "may" is the term which is practically always used in the statute and it means "shall".

Mr. MORPHY: Not always.

Mr. CARVELL: In the codification of the Railway Act, which we put through the House during the present session, we adhered to the word "may" in all cases and it was intended that the word "may" should mean "shall". I am going to go on a little further, for while this may be uninteresting I think it is of very great importance to the public:

The agreement requires a separate valuation for each of these three lines of railway. By the agreement the Crown assumes bonds of $2,500,000 secured by a trust mortgage. These bonds and the trust mortgage securing the same, in addition to being a charge on the Quebec railway, are also on other railways and properties not taken over by the Crown. By the terms of the agreement this bonded charge of $2,500,000, while it is assumed by the Crown, forms part of the purchase money payable by the Crown under the statute. If the value placed by the court on the Quebec Railway Company, known as the Quebec, Montmorency and Charlevoix railway, exceeds the $2,500,000 only the excess over the $2,500,000 and the value so found is to be paid by the Crown, the $2,500,000 being treated practically as a payment on account. If on the other hand the value placed upon the Quebec, Montmorency and Charlevoix railway is less than the $2,500,000 then the difference between the value as ascertained and the $2,500,000 is to be deducted from any sums that may be found due in respect of the other two railways.

The agreement refers to it in the following language:

"It is understood and agreed by and between all the parties hereto jointly and severally that in case the Exchequer Court of Canada fixes the value of the line of railway and other property set out in schedule C hereto at a sum less than $2,500,000, the difference between the sums so fixed and the sum of $2,500,000 shall be deducted from the aggregate amount of the purchase price to be paid for the lines of railway and other properties set out in schedule B and D hereto.

"The intention of this agreement being that in no event shall His Majesty be liable to pay for the said three lines of railway and other properties a greater amount than the value thereof as fixed by the Exchequer Court less the sum of $2,500,000 the amount of the bonds to be assumed by His Majesty as aforesaid."

That makes it very clear that the judge of the Exchequer Court was to fix the total value of the railways and in doing that he

was to take from it the amount of $2,500,000 as represented by these bonds. There were other deductions to which I shall refer later on.

There are other provisions in the agreement in question which it is unnecessary for me to refer to at the present time. There are provisions protecting and guarding the Crown against any charges or encumbrances on the properties or any defect in regard to the titles to the right of way, etc.,—the intention of the agreement clearly being that His Majesty shall receive an absolute and clear title to all the properties in question.

On the opening of the case, I suggested that the duties of the Exchequer Court did not extend to an ascertainment of whether the various railways had good titles to the properties being transferred. These questions of title are questions provided for by the agreement, and it is a matter for the crown attorneys and counsel to be satisfied upon. This view was assented to by the counsel for the railway companies and for the Crown. The court assumes that the railways are deeding the various properties with good title thereto, and the valuation is based on that assumption.

The method of procedure was one of considerable moment. I came to the conclusion that the only practical way of arriving at a result would be to adopt the method adopted in the arbitration in which I acted as counsel for the C.P.R. company in regard to what was known as the Onderdonk sections of the railway in British Columbia. The same course of procedure used to be adopted in the administration of estates in Ontario. The counsel, both for the railways and for the Crown, asquiesced in my view as to the course of procedure to be adopted. I therefore directed the railway companies to file and furnish to the Crown accounts showing in detail what they claimed to be the amount to which they were entitled under the agreement in question. I also directed that upon counsel for the Crown being furnished with these accounts they should investigate them and such items as they were prepared to admit should be admitted and such items as they were not prepared to admit would then become the subject of inquiry, and evidence could be adduced in respect thereof. I also directed that the Crown counsel should furnish to the counsel for the railways a statement of the amount which the Crown claimed should be set off for depreciation in respect of each of the three railways. Pursuant to these directions the railway companies by their counsel filed and served a complete and detailed account of their claim.

Competent experts were employed by the Crown to make a minute examination of the three lines of railway, and to furnish in detail what they considered the proper amount to be deducted for depreciation. A large amount of time was occupied by these gentlemen in making this inquiry. Subsequently, the railway companies, by their counsel, accepted as correct the amounts as found by the experts for the Crown. The amounts of the depreciation to be offset against the value of the railways has therefore been settled. The figures I will deal with later.

From a cursory reading of this I do not think the actual figures of the deductions are referred to in the judgment. Of course, they may be found in the evidence, because it was admitted by all parties:

Another question of considerable importance is in regard to the offset referred to in the statute as subsidies. Before me it was conceded by Counsel for the Crown that the only subsidies in contemplation at the time of the Statute, were subsidies granted by the Dominion Government. This view is, in my judgment, untenable. I have to follow the Statute. The Statute say "less subsidies." There is nothing in the Statute which would limit the meaning of the word "subsidies" to subsidies granted by the Dominion Government only. The word "subsidy" as defined in Webster's International dictionary, page 2070, is as follows:

"A grant of funds or property from a Government as of the state or municipal corporation to a private person or company to assist in the establishment or support of an enterprise deemed advantageous to the public, a suovention."

The manifest object of the statute is that any grants furnished by the public towards the construction of the railways should be deducted. If in point of fact the Statute and the agreement based upon the statute does not carry out what the parties intended, the only course in my judgment open to the parties is to have the statute amended. I must take the statute as I find it, and according to my view, subsidies include not merely Dominion but Provincial as well. This construction is of importance as the Quebec subsidies amount to something in the neighbourhood of $440,000, which according to the view I entertain must be deducted from the value as ascertained.

Inglis v. Buttery (1). In the Dominion Coal Co. v. Dominion Iron & Steel Co. (2). Judge Longley rejected evidence tendered as to the communings preceding the agreement, and this view was upheld in the appellate court in Nova Scotia, and also in the Privy Council (3). And in a late case the city of Toronto v. Consumers Gas Co. (4) decided by the Privy Council, Lord Shaw in delivering the judgment of the board uses the following language.

I shall not read that because it is the judgment of Lord Shaw and simply buttresses the opinion of the learned judge of of the Exchequer Court. Judge Cassels continues:

I come now to the consideration of the accounts as filed by the railways. I will deal first with that relating to the Montmorency division. The first item is dated July 1, 1898: road and equipment, real estate, buildings, etc., Montmorency division, $2,038,149.49. This starting point is assumed by the railways to have been the cost of construction up to that date. At the date in question, namely, the 1st July, 1898, according to Colonel Wurtele, the road had been constructed as far as Ste. Anne's. The mileage of this road was about 21 miles, and it may be that they were running a mile or two beyond. Even if it were granted that 22 miles instead of 21 miles of the railway had been constructed at that date, the cost would be in the neighbourhood of $92,500 a mile. Colonel Wurtele puts it about $100,000. It seems a high figure. It is stated by counsel for the railway company that a certain por-

tion of the right of way beyond Ste. Anne's had been procured. This may or may not be so. The proof before me is lacking on this point. Here there is a distinct difference between the views put forward by the counsel for the railway company and the counsel for the Crown. The counsel for the railway company contend that what the court has to do, is to find the cost as if it were an accounting between the directors of the railway and its shareholders; and that this amount being shown by the books of the company as the amount expended at that date, should therefore be accepted as the cost. Numerous witnesses were called, gentlemen of good standing—accountants from Montreal—who gave evidence as to the custom in regard to the charging up of interest, etc., to capital account.

When I deal with the case of the Saguenay railway, the absurdity of this contention put forward on the part of the railway company will be apparent. The directors of a company might have to pay fifty per cent commission for obtaining a loan of a million dollars. It would undoubtedly be quite right as between themselves and their shareholders to charge this fifty per cent in their accounts. So also they might delay construction for a period of say 20 years, in the meanwhile paying interest on this bonded indebtedness. As between the directors and their shareholders, as a matter of book-keeping, it may be quite reasonable to charge up every item of expenditure. But the case before me is of a different character. I am not dealing with the accounts as between the shareholders and their directors. What I have to ascertain is the value as between the vendor and the purchaser and that value must be the actual cost of the railways, less subsidies and less depreciation.

The railway company contend that owing to the books kept by Mr. Beemer being destroyed, there is no other proof available. There is no suggestion that there was any intention of destroying these books with the view of preventing inquiry. Colonel Wurtele's evidence is to the effect that he was the executor of Mr. Beemer, that it turned out that Mr. Beemer's estate was insolvent. He advised the heirs next of kin to relinquish all claim to the estate. The books were retained by him for several years, and as he considered them of no value, and they were occupying space required, he destroyed them. This may render it more difficult to arrive at the value. I suggested at the trial that it did not seem to me so impossible as counsel seemed to think. Two or three times I pointed out to them that it would be easy to have competent valuators go over this line of railway from Quebec to St. Anne, and to value in detail the present railway. Of course it would not be by any means conclusive. The present values would probably be considerably higher than when the road was originally constructed. Under the agreement with the Crown made pursuant to the statute, a good title has to be made to the right of way, and I would imagine that the title deeds conveying this right of way would show the price paid.

By the Trust Deed which executed on the 11th day of June, 1898, entered into after the passing of the statute, Cap. 59, 58-59 Vic. dealing with the application of the proceeds of the stock and the bonds, it is provided that out of the proceeds of the bonds, the trustees

shall pay off and redeem the present interim bonds, the whole as set forth in schedule "A" to the deed; and also to pay the floating debt detailed in schedule "B."

Now it is admitted that these two items of $500,000 referred to in schedule "A," and also the item of $794,869.58 floating liabilities, comprise part of this item of $2,038,149.40. Crown counsel in their statement were of opinion that these two items of $500,000 and $794,869.58 should be taken as the cost up to that date, namely July 1st 1898. I do not agree with that contention. I fail to see how it can be assumed without further proof that the proceeds of these interim bonds, namely $500,000, went into the construction of the railway. They may or may not. That is a question of proof. The bonds were held by the various parties shown on page 15 as Schedule "A." They were held as collateral security by the various parties. What the nature of the debts due to these various parties is I would have thought susceptible of proof—at all events before such an item can be allowed, further inquiry will be necessary, and so with regard to the liabilities.

Unquestionably a considerable portion of them never went into the railway. Colonel Wurtele states as follows:

Q. A lot of these items on their face do not appear to be items that went into the construction of the road, how is that?

A. They may have gone into the operation of the road, we were operating the railway.

It would be impossible to accept Colonel Wurtele's evidence as proving the fact that these two particular items went into the construction of the railway. Other evidence would be required before I would be willing to accept those two sums of $500,000 and $794,869.58 as having been expended in the construction of this 21 miles of railway.

I have to determine the value of the railways, the actual cost of them—and construing the statute as I think it must be construed, I would be unable upon the evidence as presented before me, to come to the conclusion that this item of two million odd dollars should be taken as being the actual cost of the railway to that date.

I do not think as I have stated before, that I am concerned with the manner in which as between the directors and their shareholders, the company kept their books. What I have to ascertain, as well as I can, is what the meaning of the words 'actual cost and value" is.

I pointed out during the progress of the trial the course which I thought might be followed. My remarks will be found at page 102, and the following pages, of the transcript of the evidence.

I may call the attention of counsel to the fact that in the trust deed, Schedule "D," at page 19, there is the estimate of cost of constructing certain extensions. The total is 11 miles—and the total estimate is $149,947, which would be under $14,000 a mile—and while of course the main railway previously built may not have been built at that low figure, the contrast between the two figures, namely, $92,500 a mile and the $14,000 a mile, is striking. There seems to be a little controversy as to the expenditure after July 1, 1898. At present it is unnecessary for me to deal with the expenditure between that time and November, 1916. It can be taken up later

on. After careful examination the Crown is willing to concede the main part of this expenditure. There are one or two items objected to, not of very much moment, and I think the evidence adduced has satisfied Crown counsel that these items should be allowed, however, it will be a matter for later consideration.

The judge deals next with the Lotbinière and Megantic railway. He says:

Dealing with the Megantic Railway, the amount involved in this railway is comparatively speaking not very large, but I think that further proof of a similar nature to that suggested in regard to the Montmorency Railway should be forthcoming. The only evidence given is that of Mr. Robins, the manager of the railway, and it is a mere surmise. He may or may not be correct when he states that it would probably cost about $11,000 a mile. I think, however, some evidence by outside witnesses qualified to speak should be forthcoming.

He then deals with the Saguenay railway, and says:

Mr. Matthews, the manager of the railway, was called as a witness. He states that the construction of the Quebec and Saguenay railway was started in April or May, 1911. Previous to that he believes exploration surveys had been made. He points out that the main construction on this road stopped some time about September, 1912, but certain small constructions were continued for quite a while. He also states as a matter of fact, on what is known as the branch spur line, from Murray Bay wharf to Nairn Falls, very considerable work was done in 1915. That branch is 7.6 miles in length, he thinks. He goes further and explains that this spur line was constructed for the purpose of handling pulp from a pulp mill situate at Nairn Falls. Referring to the main construction he states as follows:

"Q. You say that it was financial trouble that stopped you?

A. Financial trouble that stopped us.

Q. How long has it been stopped—ever since?

A. Yes.

Q. Since 1912?

A. September or October, 1912."

No further work was done with the exception of repairing crib work on the spur line, but on the main part of the line from St. Joachim to Murray Bay nothing has been done since October, 1912, and the work had to be stopped on account of the lack of money.

It is well to bear this fact in mind when you come to consider the claim made by and on behalf of the Saguenay railway. There appears to have been two flotations of bonds, and to float these bonds a discount had to be allowed of $833,600. There were fees paid according to the statement in connection with the listing of the bond issue amounting to $63,465.09. Counsel on behalf of the Crown objected to those items. It would also appear that in making up their claim of $5,543,260.89, there is an item charged of interest on the bond issue of $1,012,950. This item is also objected to by counsel for the Crown. I think the objection taken by Crown counsel is well founded. I am of opinion that this item of $1,012,950 interest payable right up to 1917 is not a charge that can be allowed under the terms of the statute. The work of construction as I have pointed out, with the exception of that small spur line, so to speak, from Murray Bay to Nairn Falls, stopped in October, 1912, and has never been gone on with, so far as the company is concerned. While, as I have stated before, as between the directors and shareholders it may be right to put in all these items of cost I do not think that as between the vendor and purchaser having regard to the wording of the statute they are proper sums to be allowed. The statute, as I have pointed out, is precise and to my mind unambiguous. The consideration to be paid is the value of the railways, the said value to be the actual cost of the said railways less subsidies and less depreciation.

Then there are two or three pages of legal argument and citation of cases, giving the decisions of the court upon questions of actual value. I do not think I will trouble the committee with reading them, because, after all, we have to take up the conclusion arrived at by Mr. Justice Cassels. His conclusions are:

In Kirby & Stewart vs. The King (1) a case tried before me, I refused to allow the contractor interest which he had paid to the bank for moneys required for the purpose of the construction of the work. That case was appealed to the Supreme Court of Canada and my ruling sustained. There is a difference between that case and the present in this respect: the claim there made was by the contractor, and he had been allowed the usual contractors' profits. The words of the reference, by the Order in Council in that case, were that he was to be allowed the "actual and reasonable cost."

To my mind, to allow these charges for obtaining money and the interest for a period of years might make the matter almost farcical. The railway might have laid dormant for a period of another 20 years, meanwhile the interest on the bonds would have to be paid, amounting to two or three more million dollars, all of which, assuming the company paid the interest would be charged up in their books to the shareholders, and if the argument put forward is correct in that case, the Crown when paying what is defined by the statute to be the actual cost of the railways would be paying some three million dollars odd for interest for which no value is given in return.

The views of the various accountants seem to vary. Some of them apparently were rather shocked at the length to which their evidence would lead, and came to the conclusion that the interest could only be a proper charge during a reasonable period of construction.

It will be easy when the case is concluded to arrive at the amount which in my judgment ought to be allowed. There will have to be deducted the allowance for depreciation which has been settled. There will also have to be deducted the amounts received from the Dominion and provincial subsidies. These sums are not in dispute. There will also have to be deducted these items that I have just been referring to in connection with the Saguenay railway and any amounts that

should be deducted from the Montmorency & Charlevoix railway, and the Megantic railway on a proper valuation being proved.

I have taken up some time, but I think it is well worth the time to have it on record. Just shortly, I want to give my deductions from this judgment—and I desire to state that I have gone over it very hurriedly since the discussion started, but I think I have correctly summarized the judgment as to the figures.

Mr. COCHRANE: Is it a judgment or statement?

Mr. CARVELL: I have read the judgment.

Mr. COCHRANE: Is it a judgment?

Mr. CARVELL: No, it is not a final judgment.

Mr. COCHRANE: It is a statement.

Mr. CARVELL: It is quite a statement.

Mr. COCHRANE: I agree with you.

Mr. CARVELL: If I started out to reargue the case with that statement before me I would have a very hard job. I am going to give the deductions which I drew from that statement so far as possible. I admit there are some things which are obscure.

Mr. NESBITT: It is his judgment.

Mr. CARVELL: It is his judgment.

Mr. COCHRANE: No, it is not his judgment.

Mr. CARVELL: You can have your views, and I will have mine. It is his judgment, and is headed "Judgment delivered 24th day of January, 1914," and it will go down to all time as the judgment of Mr. Justice Cassels, and will be reported in the Exchequer Court Reports of Canada, and it provides that if they want to appeal from it they have the right to do so, and we are told they have not appealed. If they do appeal we will have another judgment in the Supreme Court of Canada Reports either confirming or disagreeing with this judgment. I have taken these three railways in the order in which Judge Cassels discusses them. I take the claim of the Quebec and Montmorency railway at $2,038,149, and I take the total of the two amounts of $500,000 and $749,869, which is $1,294,869, and subtract it from the $2,038,149, which leaves the value of the Quebec and Montmorency road at $743,280, less of course deductions. In the judgment there are no figures as to amounts expended upon construction since 1st July, 1898. I take it they are very inconsiderable and would play no important part whatever in the final statement of the case.

Mr. REID: Do I understand that the hon. member figures up the cost of the Quebec, Montmorency and Charlevoix as $743,280?

Mr. CARVELL: Yes.

Mr. REID: You are making those deductions from what amount?

Mr. CARVELL: From $2,038,149. There may have been some amounts expended on construction after 1st July, 1898, but if there are any, Sir Walter Cassels makes no reference to them in his judgment.

I come next to the Lotbinière and Megantic, and we have so little evidence on this that I take the statement as I find it. Thirty miles at $11,000 a mile amounts to $330,000. I take next the Quebec and Saguenay. The total amount claimed by the company would be $5,543,260. Sir Walter Cassels says that from that should be deducted the three items:

Commissions, including commissions on bonds	$ 863,000
Commissions of other kinds	63,465
Interest	1,012,950
Total	$1,939,415

I subtract that from the total claim, and I have a balance left of $3,503,845. Add to that the other two amounts, namely, $743,280 and $330,000, and I have a total of $4,577,125 as the cost of the three lines of railway. I first take from that the $2,500,000 bond issue, because Sir Walter Cassels says that the bond indebtedness is a first charge and first payment. That brings the total down to $2,077,125. Then there must be deducted from that the amount of subsidies. I have no positive evidence, but I am assuming that there would be double subsidies. The Dominion subsidies would amount to $672,000 only on the Quebec and Saguenay and the Quebec, Montmorency and Charlevoix. That is, the subsidies on the total line from Quebec to Murray Bay would be 105 miles at a double subsidy of $6,400 per mile, or $672,000. Adding that to the amount of $440,000 contributed by the province of Quebec, I have a total of $1,112,000 of subsidies. I have no knowledge of whether any subsidies were paid on the Lotbinière and Megantic, therefore, I have not taken that into the calculation, but it may be possible that I have charged too much for the subsidies on the Quebec, Montmorency and Charlevoix, so that I

think we shall find that the two items counteract each other, and that my figures are approximately correct. I have, then, subtracted the amount of the subsidies, namely, $1,112,000, from the total of $2,077,125, and I find that the actual value of the three lines, less depreciation, is only $965,125. I leave it to the minister and every member of the House who has listened to me—and I am obliged to hon. members for the great courtesy with which they have listened to my somewhat lengthy remarks—whether I am right in my figures and have made the proper deductions from Sir Walter Cassel's judgment. If so, the total value of the three lines of railway, less depreciation, is less than $1,000,000. Why on earth does the Minister of Railways, with his sense of justice, want to pay this company nearly $4,000,000 for three lines of railway which are worth, according to the findings of a judge of the Exchequer Court of Canada, less than $1,000,000?

Mr. REID: I stated a few moments ago that the Government intended dropping the Quebec, Montmorency and Charlevoix and the Lotbinière and Megantic out of the item. Do I understand the hon. member to say that the judge had valued the Quebec and Saguenay at $3,503,845?

Mr. CARVELL: Yes.

Mr. REID: From that would be deducted any subsidies that had been paid. The only subsidy that has been paid is $248,000 so that the amount would be in the neighbourhood of $3,255,845. Am I right in that?

Mr. CARVELL: I think so.

Mr. REID: The bond issue of $2,500,000 would not come into the matter at all, because those bonds are on the Quebec, Montmorency and Charlevoix. As we are abandoning the Quebec, Montmorency and Charlevoix and the Lotbinière and Megantic railways, we have had to deal with only the Quebec and Saguenay. The Government therefore, would have to pay only $3,255,845. Am I right in that?

Mr. CARVELL: Yes. Is the Minister of Customs willing to justify in this House the payment of $3,255,845, in this time of stress, for a railway that has not had a rail on it, that has not even all the grading done, when he can secure for a much smaller amount a line of railway which he admits paid over $100,000 last year? What earthly influence has Sir Rodolphe Forget over the Government?

Mr. COCHRANE: We have not paid anything yet.

Mr. CARVELL: I am afraid—

Mr. COCHRANE: Why did we not pay last year?

Mr. CARVELL: Because you were waiting for the judgment of the judge of the Exchequer Court.

Mr. COCHRANE: And we will wait for it.

Mr. CARVELL: I am glad to hear that.

Mr. REID: And we will not pay anything until the next session of Parliament when the matter is decided.

Mr. CARVELL: We are getting along.

Mr. REID: I stated that a few minutes ago.

Mr. CARVELL: We are gradually getting the amount reduced. If we stay here till morning, we may get the whole of it. It would be worth sitting here all night to save $3,000,000 to the country in this time of stress. The minister has dropped the Lotbinière and Megantic out of the item. That is gone. I am glad the Government railways are not going into the portion of Quebec and repeating their telephone experience in the county of Dorchester. We come next to the Quebec, Montmorency and Charlevoix, the road which, we all know, does pay. The minister, I think, claims that it was $100,000 to the good last year. By what reasoning does he justify refusing to take that portion of the road which would be of some value and taking that portion which has not been constructed yet, which is of no value and which is paying no money?

12 m.

Mr. COCHRANE: In the first place it is a very expensive piece of road to build, and a great deal of expense has been put upon it.

Mr. CARVELL: What does the minister want it for in war time? The justification for going into this expenditure a year ago was this: Well, we are buying branch lines for the Intercolonial; we believe we should extend the Intercolonial, make it as big a concern as we can and reach out and accomodate the people. The Government argued that the Intercolonial, by means of a ferry and by a good deal of mythology was in the city of Quebec, and, therefore, when they bought this line from Quebec down to Murray Bay, it was simply an extension of the Intercolonial. Now they propose to drop the first thirty or forty

miles of it running from Quebec eastward, which part is a paying proposition, and then they drop in behind that again and go from there to Murray Bay where the road will not pay and is not even constructed,—and they want to pay $3,255,845 for it.

Mr COCHRANE: We will pay what the judge says. I have made that statement several times in the House. My hon. friend from Rouville (Mr. Lemieux) will bear me out in that.

Mr. CARVELL: I would oppose that with greater vehemence than I would any other scheme that has been proposed here for years, because that is the one thing for which there is no justification as a matter of principle. When they take that attitude they get away to some extent from the absolute position in which the judge places them. With that judgment staring them in the face, I do not see how they can possibly take over the whole system. Finding themselves up against that stone wall, they must stand by Sir Rodolphe Forget and get him out of the difficulty in which he is placed. They abandon the other part of the road because they cannot help themselves on account of the Cassels judgment, but they say: Notwithstanding the statute of 1916, notwithstanding the finding of Mr. Justice Cassels, we are going to pay Sir Rodolphe Forget for a road which has not yet been constructed.

Mr. SEVIGNY: Does my hon. friend not know that besides Sir Rodolphe Forget there are 60,000 people in that district who for two hundred years have been without railway accommodation?

Mr. CARVELL: I should not be surprised to know that. Along the river St. John in my province, the people were without railway facilities for 125 or 130 years.

Mr. SEVIGNY: Have they railway accommodation now?

Mr. CARVELL: We built a railway ourselves. We made a mess of it, but we built it just the same—we did not get it from this Government. I do not argue that a railway along the north shore of the St. Lawrence is not a necessity; a railway is a necessity wherever people live. I should be glad indeed to see the people on the north shore of the St. Lawrence have a railway. But I am pointing out the facts, the Government propose to buy this railway and to leave it to the Exchequer Court to assess the value. His decision makes it impossible for them to carry out their original intention. The minister now proposes to put through a vote to buy a roadbed, a right of way, which has not upon it even the proverbial two streaks of rust; he is going to spend perhaps $2,500,000 or $3,000,000 on it at a time, as set forth by the member for Kingston, when no unnecessary expenditure should be made. There is no doubt that the railway would be a convenience, but I cannot conceive upon what ground the Minister of Railways proposes to go on with an expenditure of this kind under present conditions. I have pleasure in seconding the motion of the member for North Oxford (Mr. Nesbitt) that this item be struck out.

Mr. COCHRANE: There is no question in the minds of members of the Committee who know anything about this railway that the line is absolutely necessary. I admit that this is a very inopportune time to take action in the matter, but I point out that the railway was pretty well constructed before the commencement of the war and the action of the waves along the shore has been gradually destroying the roadbed. Last year the Government, in its wisdom, made an agreement with Sir Rodolphe Forget and his company for the taking over of these three roads, leaving to the Exchequer Court the determination of the value. The member for Carleton has made a great deal of capital out of the findings of the Exchequer Court. I find no fault with the decisions that have been arrived at. I have several times made the statement that we do not propose to pay anything except what the Exchequer Court awards. If I had my way I would buy the Saguenay road only, and complete it. We did do some riprap work this year along where the contractors had built before; they had riprapped with earth and it was being washed away. The only fault I have to find with the Exchequer Court's decision is this: the judge might have allowed a reasonable amount of interest for construction time. The member for Carleton will admit, I think, that that is railway practice. If he reads the evidence taken before the judge, he will agree that this interest should have been allowed. More than three years' interest, however, could not be allowed, because three years is a reasonable time within which the company could complete the road. We do not propose to pay Sir Rodolphe Forget one dollar of this money until the new Parliament meets and a Bill is submitted for the taking over of the Quebec and Saguenay road, the value to be left to the decision of the Exchequer

Court. I would not allow any discounts on bonds, or things like that, but I think it is only fair and reasonable that some reasonable amount, say 5 per cent for three years, should be paid by way of interest during construction.

Mr. CARVELL: Will the minister state why he would recommend taking over the Quebec and Saguenay road, and not the other two?

Mr. COCHRANE: Simply because I do not think we can buy the other road at what it is worth. The Quebec and Saguenay road is absolutely necessary; the people who will be served by it are closed out from communication with the outside world during seven months of the year. If so much money had not been spent on the road, I would not consider it so necessary to finish it now, but it is deteriorating fast and it is necessary that the work should be undertaken. I ask the committee to pass this vote, and I give my word of honour that no money will be paid for the road, except that in connection with construction, until a Bill is submitted giving authority to take over the Saguenay line, leaving to the Exchequer Court the determination of what it is worth.

Mr. PROULX: If the holders of the road were satisfied to take what the judgment of the Exchequer Court direct, would the minister pay the amount?

Mr. COCHRANE: I do not know whether they were satisfied to do that; I have never asked them. I will say that if they will not take what the finding of the Exchequer Court sets forth, we will expropriate and take it over that way.

Mr. CARVELL: We understand, then, that nothing will be done at all until after another Parliament has met and legislation has been enacted?

Mr. REID: Quite so, because you could not even expropriate it. Nothing will be done, even in the way of expropriation, until after a new Bill is introduced.

Mr. McKENZIE: How does the minister know that Parliament will make the new bargain that he proposes? He came to this Parliament a year ago last May with a proposal to buy a group of four railways. An Act was put through enabling the Governor in Council to take it over. Money was expended in connection with the transaction; an Order in Council must have been passed; the road must have been taken over. I assume that the minister would not spend a dollar on the road until he had taken it over. We, as a committee, must take it for granted that the road is taken over. The whole Committee being anxious to help the situation, are we not entitled to see the Order in Council in virtue of which the minister acted upon the Statute of 1916? If that Order in Council took over those four roads, all that remains is to ascertain how much they are worth. The Order in Council tested the title of the road in the Crown, and it belongs to the Crown, and nothing remains but to find out how much we are to pay for it. Surely hon. gentlemen supporting the Government will admit that the Order in Council should be before us.

Mr. REID: All these documents have been laid on the table.

Mr. McKENZIE: I do not want to be impolite to the minister, but this eternal telling us that something was laid on the table is not satisfactory. What information does it convey to me or to anyone else who has no notice of the fact? If the practice were followed by the Government that copies of those Orders in Council would be put in Members' post office boxes, it would be different, but to lay them on the Table and tell us months afterwards they were laid on the table, is no information to me at all events. Before I am asked to vote three or four million dollars of the people's money, I would like to see the deed to the property we are buying. If I understand this statute at all, it gives the Government power to pass an order vesting this property in the Government. I take it for granted that that Order in Council would duly vest the property in the Government. After that Order in Council was passed they started in with an array of counsel on both sides to ascertain the amount they were to pay for the railway. Now we are told the whole thing is off and that they are to begin over again on a new statute. If the minister will tell us we are going to clean the slate absolutely, and to start over again and see what Parliament will do, then, as a lawyer and trying to be of some use in this House, I would be prepared to say, all right. But I am not prepared to vote this money when we are told we are not getting the property at all. And I appeal to any sensible business man here to say if he is willing to provide money to pay for a property we did not get.

Mr. COCHRANE: I have stated we will not pay any money.

Mr. CARVELL: The very fact that the minister has stated he will not pay any money or do anything until there is a final finding of the judge of the Exchequer Court—

Mr. COCHRANE: Nothing, except operating the road.

Mr. CARVELL: —and that the Government will not take it over until a new Parliament passes legislation, is the very strongest reason I have for voting against this item. I take the minister's word absolutely when he tells the House that he will not do certain things. I take it without any reservation whatever. But if he is not going to do these things until the new Parliament assembles and new legislation is passed, then that new Parliament can provide the money to carry out this legislation.

Mr. COCHRANE: But we want to be paid for the moneys we have spent on it.

Mr. CARVELL: If the minister was foolish enough to spend money upon it before the finding of Judge Cassels, or if after the finding he has been foolish enough to spend money, then, much as I respect him. I cannot stand up in my place in Parliament and vote to reimburse him. I may not be here in the new Parliament. None of us know what is going to happen, but as I am here, and as I have the right, I want to try to leave the record as clear as I can, and I propose to vote against the item.

Mr. PROULX: Will the minister go on and spend more money under this resolution as was spent last year before the judgment of Mr. Justice Cassels and before there was an agreement made with the owners of the road? It seems to me the Government wants to provide money to go on now and spend it on the construction of the road previous to and during the election. Of course, that will help Sir Rodolphe Forget and some of the friends of the Government in the election. If a new statute is required to be passed by a new Parliament in order to expend the money, I do not see why we should vote the money now. I agree with my hon. friend from Kingston that the owners of the road should not have been too greedy. They should have accepted the amount fixed by the Exchequer Court, and if they were not satisfied with that they should have appealed to the Supreme Court, rather than come back to Parliament. They should have taken advantage of the statute passed last year. I do not feel disposed to go beyond what was done last year.

Motion (Mr. Nesbitt), to strike out, lost on division. Yeas, 14; nays, 29.

Resolution agreed to.

Progress reported.

On motion of Hon. Mr. Reid, the House adjourned at 12.25 a.m. (Friday).

Friday, September 7, 1917.

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

MILITARY SERVICE ACT, 1917.

APPOINTMENT OF THE BOARD OF SELECTION.

Right Hon. Sir GEORGE FOSTER: I move, seconded by the Hon. Mr. Cochrane:

That the following gentlemen compose the board of selection to appoint members of local tribunals under section 6 of the Military Service Act, 1917:

Ontario: A. E. Fripp, M.P., Ottawa; W. A. Boys, M.P., Barrie; Sir John Gibson, Hamilton; A. B. Lowe, 41 Glenn Street, Ottawa.

Quebec: Joseph H. Rainville, M.P., St. Lambert; Romeo Langlois, K.C., Quebec; Hon. S. N. Parent, Montreal; Hon. Sydney Fisher, Knowlton.

Nova Scotia: George S. Campbell, Halifax; D. A. Cameron, Sydney, C.B.

New Brunswick: Mariner G. Teed, St. John; John McCaffery, Fredericton.

Manitoba: Senator W. H. Sharp, Manitou; Sir Donald MacMillan, Winnipeg.

Saskatchewan: Senator H. W. Laird, Regina; Arthur Hitchcock, Moosejaw.

Alberta: R. B. Bennett, M.P., Calgary; Alfred H. Clarke, K.C., Calgary.

British Columbia: R. F. Green, M.P., Victoria; Hon. James Horace King, Victoria.

Yukon: Lieut.-Col. A. Thompson, M.D., M.P., Ottawa; F. C. Wade, Vancouver.

Prince Edward Island: William L. Cotton, Charlottetown; James J. Johnston, K.C., Charlottetown.

Sir WILFRID LAURIER: It is of course to be understood from the remarks I made on a previous occasion, that we on this side of the House offer no opposition to this motion. On the contrary, I intimated that I would consent to concur in the selection of the men who are to appoint the members of the tribunals which are to administer the Act.

I must say, however, once more that I deeply regret that the Government has thought it advisable to apply this law of conscription before the people have had occasion to pronounce upon it. I think, and my opinion is con-

firmed more and more, as time passes, that it would have been more in the interest of the country at large if at least the people had been consulted before the law was applied. I must say frankly that if I had followed my first inclination I would not have given countenance to any participation in the administration of the Act. But, on the whole, I believe that it is always better to minimize the evil effect of a bad law by the wisest administration of it so that effort may be directed to making the application of it fair to all parties and to getting out of it the largest possible measure of justice compatible with its provisions.

I have therefore given consideration to the selection of the members to compose the board of selection, and in so doing I have endeavoured to recommeend men whose standing in the community will be a guarantee that as far as they are concerned the Act will be applied with fairness, and a determination to do justice to all.

Sir SAM HUGHES: Might I ask my right hon. friend (Sir Wilfrid Laurier) how he would explain the further delay to be occasioned by his proposition in enforcing this Military Service Act? I doubt very much if, owing to the delay already occasioned there will be a battalion at the front under this Act before the war is over and peace concluded. If the right hon. gentleman were returned to power, how would he provide for meeting this emergency?

Sir WILFRED LAURIER: If the soldiers are not to get to the front till the war is over, better consult the people at once.

Motion agreed to.

Sir GEORGE FOSTER moved that a message be sent to the Senate to inform their honours that this House has passed the following resolution:

Resolved by the House of Commons of Canada, that the following gentlemen do compose the board of selection to appoint members of local tribunals under section 6 of the Military Service Act 1917:

Ontario: A. E. Fripp, M.P., Ottawa; W. A. Boys, M.P., Barrie, Ont.; Sir John Gibson, Hamilton, Ont.; A. B. Lowe, 41 Glenn St., Ottawa.

Quebec: Joseph Rainville, M.P., St. Lambert; Romeo Langlois, K.C., Quebec; Hon. S. N. Parent, Montreal, Que.; Hon. Sidney Fisher, Knowlton, Quebec.

Nova Scotia: Geo. S. Campbell, Halifax, N.S.; D. A. Cameron, Barrister, Sydney, C.B.

New Brunswick: Mariner G. Teed, St. John, N.B.; John McCaffrey, Fredericton, N.B.

Manitoba: Senator W. H. Sharp, Manitou; Sir Donald MacMillan, Winnipeg, Man.

Saskatchewan: Senator H. W. Laird, Regina; Arthur Hitchcock, Moosejaw, Sask.

Alberta: R. B. Bennett, M.P., Calgary; Alfred H. Clarke, K.C., Calgary, Alberta.

British Columbia: R. F. Green, M.P., Victoria, B.C.; Hon. James Horace King, Victoria, B.C.

Yukon: Lt.-Col. A. Thompson, M.D., M.P., Ottawa; F. C. Wade, Vancouver.

Prince Edward Island: Wm. L. Cotton, Charlottetown; James J. Johnston, K.C., Charlottetown, P.E.I.

And requesting that their honours will unite with this House in the said resolution by filling up the blank therein with the words "Senate and."

Motion agreed to.

THE WAR TIMES ELECTION ACT.

On the Orders of the Day:

Mr. GLASS: I desire to bring to the attention of the House a misapprehension in reference to a question which I addressed to the hon. Secretary of State (Mr. Meighen) when he was presenting the Franchise Bill yesterday. I asked if provision had been made for the taking of the votes of the wives and female relatives of soldiers who themselves were overseas. I did not mean the wives or relatives of soldiers who were in Canada but I referred to those who were themselves overseas and I desired to ask if provision had been made for their voting The answer given by my hon. friend the Secretary of State was apparently given under a misapprehension as to the meaning of my question. I would like to put the question now in its proper form and as I intended it.

Mr. SPEAKER: Questions such as this ought properly to go on the Order Paper because, if they did no mistake would arise.

Mr. MEIGHEN: The question as put referred to soldier's wives who, themselves, were overseas. It was intended to be a question as to the eligibility to vote of the female relatives who were overseas and in that latter form the answer is "no."

WAR TAX UPON INCOMES.

CONSIDERATION OF AMENDMENTS MADE BY THE SENATE DEFERRED.

The House proceeded to consider the amendments made by the Senate to Bill No. 117, to authorize the levying of a war tax upon certain incomes.—Sir Thomas White.

Sir THOMAS WHITE (Minister of Finance): This order involves the consideration of amendments by the Senate to Bill No. 117, being an Act to authorize the levying of a war tax upon certain incomes. The hon. the Senate has made certain amendments of which I shall now inform the House. In section 3 of the Bill, instead of

the words "annual profit or gain," the Senate has inserted the word "net" before the word "profit," so that, for the purposes of the Act, "income" means the "annual net profit or gain or gratuity." That is the only change made in subsection 1 section 3 with the exception of striking out the following words:

—with the following exemptions and deductions:

(a) the value of property acquired by gift, bequest, devise or descent;

(b) the proceeds of life insurance policies paid upon the death of the person insured, or payments made or credited to the insured on life insurance endowment or annuity contracts upon the maturity of the term mentioned in the contract or upon the surrender of the contract:

Instead of those words, the Senate has substituted the following:

Including the income from but not the value of property acquired by gift, bequest, devise or descent; and including the income from but not the proceeds of life insurance policies paid upon the death of the person insured or payments made or credited to the insured on life insurance endowment or annuity contracts upon the maturity of the term mentioned in the contract or upon the surrender of the contract; with the following exemptions and deductions.

And then follow the exemptions and deductions included in subsections c, d, e, and f of section 3 of the Bill.

Mr. NESBITT: Would the minister read the first part again?

Sir THOMAS WHITE: Perhaps I had better explain it. As the Bill left the House of Commons, "income" meant the annual profit or gain or gratuity derived as stated in the Act, with among other exemptions, those which I have just read, a and b. The idea was to exempt from the income which a person derived during the year the amount of money or value which he might receive on a devise or bequest, or in respect of a life insurance policy. When we were debating the matter in the House, it seems clear to all here that what we were exempting was the principal, and if, by chance, that principal was invested, then the income derived from it would, of course be income under the Act. The Senate has endeavoured to make that clear so that while the principal of life insurance policies and of any devise or bequest is exempted, income derived in respect of that principal becomes income for the purposes of the Act.

Then, further, the Senate has inserted, after subsection 1 of section 3, the following:

Provided, however, that in determining the income the personal and living expenses shall not be taken into consideration.

[Sir Thomas White.]

Then, further, they have made an amendment to section 6. That section as it left this House provided that:

All persons in whatever capacity acting, having the control, receipt, disposal or payment of fixed or determinable annual periodical gains, profits, or income of any taxpayer..... shall, on behalf of such taxpayer, deduct and withhold an amount equal to the tax payable on the same under this Act.

The Senate has inserted before the word "tax" the word "normal," so that now those having control of the income of others shall deduct and forward to the minister only the normal tax. I think their reason for doing that was because they apprehended there would be difficulty in determining the amount of tax, normal and super-tax. But, of course, the party himself would be liable in respect of the super-tax upon his income as the Bill now reads.

Further, the Senate has inserted a rather important provision in section 19. I may say that section 19 is as follows:

No assessment shall be set aside by a Board or by the court upon the ground that there has been any error or omission in connection with any proceedings required to be taken under this Act or any regulation hereunder, but such Board or Court in any case that may come before it may determine the true and proper amount of the tax to be paid hereunder.

The Senate has added this proviso:

a. All the proceedings of the Board and of the Exchequer Court shall be held in camera if requested by the taxpayer.

I am aware that there is a difference of opinion as to the powers of the Senate under our constitutional usages in respect to a taxation measure; but we are near the end of this session, there is a great deal of business before both Houses, and this is an important enactment providing for the raising of moneys which we shall require in connection with the prosecution of the war, and in the circumstances I propose to move:

That the House do concur in the amendments made by the Senate.

But I should like to make this statement in connection with my motion, in order that it may appear upon Hansard: That as there are differences of opinion respecting the powers of the Senate in amending a taxation measure, our concurrence in these amendments is not to be regarded as a precedent binding upon this House in any future legislation. It seems to me that that leaves the question fairly as regards the privileges of this House, and not unfairly as respects the action taken by the Senate.

The amendments are not of great consequence, and neither the legislation nor its administration will, I think, be materially affected thereby.

Mr. GRAHAM: The amendment to subsection (f) is capable of two constructions:

Provided, however, that in determining the income, the personal and living expenses shall not be taken into consideration.

Which construction are we to put on it—that the living expenses will not be deducted before the net income is arrived at, or that they will?

Sir THOMAS WHITE: I am clear that it will be construed that they are not to be deducted. If we were not so close to the end of the session I would be disposed either to amend this amendment or to move to strike it out; but in the circumstances, by reason of the importance of the Bill, I think it preferable to move to concur. In administering the Act we shall undoubtedly interpret it that the personal and living expenses are not to be deducted, which is, I think, the meaning the Senate had in view.

Mr. GRAHAM: The uncertainty still exists.

Mr. MACDONALD: Do you think that is a sound proposition?

Sir THOMAS WHITE: Yes, because I think that is the true interpretation.

Mr. MACDONALD: Does the minister think it is a proper principle that they should not be deducted?

Sir THOMAS WHITE: If my hon. friend has an income of $10,000 I am certainly of the opinion that he should not be allowed to deduct his living and personal expenses from that amount, in order to ascertain the amount of his income which would be assessable under this Act. My hon. friend might have an income of $10,000 a year, and might spend $9,000 of it, perhaps part of it very luxuriously, and another hon. gentleman might have an income of $10,000 and might spend only $2,000 for personal and living expenses. According to my hon. friend's view, the latter gentleman would be taxed on an income of $8,000, whereas my hon. friend from Pictou (Mr. Macdonald) would be assessed for only $1,000.

Sir WILFRID LAURIER: The Bill provides that out of every income $3,000 is to be deducted. I suppose that would be for living expenses. Are a man's living expenses to be deducted in addition to that?

Sir THOMAS WHITE: No.

Sir WILFRID LAURIER: What is the meaning of the amendment?

Sir THOMAS WHITE: A person's living expenses shall not be taken into consideration. The intention of the Senate is, undoubtedly, that the living expenses are not to be deducted from the income. The $3,000 exemption still stands. The Senate has not touched that.

Sir WILFRID LAURIER: But do you add to this the living expenses?

Sir THOMAS WHITE: No.

Mr. MACDONALD: I would not think that, as a matter of constitutional practice, my hon. friend can recognize the right of the Senate to amend taxation legislation passed by this House. As a matter of fact, under our constitution the Senate either has the power to amend a tax Bill which goes from this House to them, or it has not. If the Senate has not that right to amend then this House cannot waive its constitutional right by concurrence in these amendments as is proposed by the hon. Minister of Finance. My hon. friend is proceeding in a very peculiar manner in regard to a very important principle.

Sir THOMAS WHITE: What would you do about it?

Mr. MACDONALD: My hon. friend gives as a reason for setting aside the constitution, if he thinks the constitution is being set aside, as I gather he does: that we are getting near the close of the session, and that therefore, we should concede the right of the Senate to amend a tax measure. There are many important measures before the Senate, and if the principle stated by my hon. friend is sound I presume he will follow it in regard to any other Bill that comes before us, no matter what it may be.

Sir THOMAS WHITE: I desire to correct my hon. friend. I did not express any definite view on the question. I stated that there were differences of opinion, and, that being so, I thought that, in view of the importance of the situation, and considering the fact that the session is drawing to a close, we should concur in the amendment, placing, at the same time, upon Hansard the statement which I made that it would not be regarded as a precedent. I may say that in 1874 a similar course was followed.

Mr. MACDONALD: Then my hon. friend expresses no opinion as to the constitu-

tionality of the question, whether taxation measures can be amended by the Senate. My hon. friend sets aside that point by saying: "We are getting near the close of the session, and I am going to content myself, so far as the constitutional rights of the other branch of Parliament are concerned, by saying something and placing it on Hansard." There is a number of important measures before the Senate, which may come back to us before prorogation, and I assume the Minister of Finance will follow that same principle whether it be opposed to the contitution or not. If the Senate has not the right to amend this measure, my hon. friend is not justified in the course he has adopted. I have not been able to gather, in the short statement made by the Minister of Finance, the whole effect of these amendments, but I say that the importance of this measure requires that full attention should be paid by this House to the amendments the Senate has made. I see no reason why there should be any proceedings in camera in determining the amount of income on which a man should be taxed. There is no reason why the whole question as to taxation should not be conducted openly and aboveboard. If certain people in this country who are in receipt of large incomes are to be permitted to have a hole-and-corner tribunal to hear their cases, and the public are not going to know anything about the investigation, it will be an unfortunate thing. I say this Bill has not gone far enough in dealing with the contribution to the expense of this war by people who are in position to pay. I think, by comparison with taxation measures in other countries, that, as pointed out by the hon. member for Lambton (Mr. Pardee) when the Bill was before the House sometime ago, we have not begun to take the course we should adopt in dealing with this question. When my hon. friend tells us, that this measure has been considered by this Parliament, that the man of very large income is to be protected, the public is debarred, from any knowledge as to whether or not he has been dealt with in a proper way by the tribunal, and this man is permitted to say: "I desire this investigation to be a private one," I say that my hon. friend is asserting a principal which is not sound. The public in this country have a right to know whether or not a man of large income has been properly dealt with, and whether the evidence given in regard to that income justifies the finding of the tribunal. It may be urged that it is not a pleasant thing for one's personal affairs to be investigated by the public, but that is no answer. The conditions to-day are such that these problems, so far as delicacy is concerned, have to be disregarded, and if we are to permit a stipulation in this Bill, under which a man of large income can escape liability without the public knowing whether an investigation has been held, I say it is a pernicious principle. I am opposed to permitting the Senate to introduce such a provision, and I am opposed to this House accepting it. I think the House should debate these questions fully. I only know the purport of two amendments, but we are not in such great haste that we cannot take full time to consider the effects of these amendments, and what our rights and position in Parliament are with reference to this whole question. What possible motive can there be for amending this Bill by inserting such a provision? Why should it be done?

The minister has given no good reason for the adoption of the course he suggests. This House is not going to rise to-morrow or on Monday. There are on the Order Paper a large number of important Bills which have occupied the attention of the House for many days; some of them are now engaging the attention of the other branch of Parliament. We should give this matter that attention which the people expect us to give to measures of such great importance. Moreover, it is understood that if this measure leaves Parliament in the terms proposed by the Minister of Finance the business profits war tax will be continued another year? We have two conflicting statements on that point. We were told at one time that the business profits war tax would cease at the end of this year.

Mr. SPEAKER: I would remind the hon. member that the motion before the House is that certain amendments made by the Senate to a certain Bill be concurred in. It is not in order for the hon. member to now discuss the general principle of the Bill.

Mr. MACDONALD: I was not discussing the general principle of the Bill. With all due deference to you, Sir, I submit that the attitude of the Government with reference to the problem of taxation is involved in the matter that we are now discussing. I was pointing out that conflicting statements had been made in regard to the business profits war tax, and I was making inquiry as to the policy of the Government in the matter.

Mr. SPEAKER: The Bill itself has been considered in this House and we are now considering certain amendments made by the Senate. I would point out to the House that we are not now in committee and so hon. members are limited to one speech. I have somewhat relaxed the rule in the case of the Minister of Finance, in order that a proper explanation might be made.

Mr. MACDONALD: If there is a discussion on the subject, I assume that the minister will reply. If he does not, I hope that some other member of the Government will do so, because I want the Government to tell us what their position is in regard to this matter. The question whether this House should accept certain amendments made by the Senate to this important measure is I submit, relevant to the matter that we are now considering. The principle involved in this amendment, that the personal expenses of the individual are not to be taken into consideration in determining his net income for the purposes of taxation is a matter closely related to the whole policy of the Government as to taxation; therefore an inquiry as to the Government's policy is germane to the discussion. As to the constitutionality of the action of the Senate, I object to the Minister of Finance binding this House by putting anything on Hansard on the subject, one way or the other. That is not the way constitutional assemblies deal with things of this kind. The last amendment made by the Senate was the only one that I had opportunity of understanding clearly. For myself I object to the proposal that appeals should be heard before these tribunals in camera in order that the amount of taxation to be paid by any wealthy person may be ascertained. As to the amendment regarding net income. I was not able to understand the ministers explanation. I do not think that members of this House are really seized of what the amendments are; it is difficult, therefore, for hon. gentlemen really to understand them.

Sir WILFRID LAURIER: It is a well-known principle that the Upper Chamber can reject any Bill, even though it deals with financial matters, that has been passed by this House. The Senate can reject the Supply Bill; it can reject a Bill adopted by the Committee of Ways and Means of this House, but it cannot amend such Bills. This principle has been affirmed over and over again. I submit that the motion of the Minister of Finance is out of order. Rule 78 says:

> All aids and supplies granted to His Majesty by the Parliament of Canada are the sole gift of the House of Commons, and all Bills for granting such aids and supplies ought to begin with the House, as it is the undoubted right of the House to direct, limit, and appoint in all such Bills, the ends, purposes, considerations, conditions, limitations and qualifications of such grants, which are not alterable by the Senate.

This rule covers all Bills passed by the House of Commons dealing with financial matters, including those Bills the purpose of which is the raising of revenue through taxation.

Mr. SPEAKER: May I ask the right hon. gentleman if he will deal with rule 87, page 44, while he is discussing this point of order?

Sir WILFRID LAURIER: I will come to that. A motion has been made that the House concur in amendments made by the Senate to a Bill the purpose of which is to impose taxation. I submit that, under the terms laid down in Rule 78, such a motion is out if order. I now come to rule 87, which is in these terms:

> In order to expedite the business of Parliament, the House will not insist on the privilege claimed and exercised by them, of laying aside Bills sent from the Senate because they impose pecuniary penalties;

That would not apply in this case, because the Bill in question is one which was passed by this House and sent to the Senate, not one which was passed by the Senate and sent to this House. The rule continues:

> nor of laying aside amendments made by the Senate because they introduce into or alter pecuniary penalties in Bills sent to them by this House;

This Bill does not impose or introduce any penalties; therefore it does not come within the purview of that part of the rule. (Reading):

> provided that all such penalties thereby imposed, are only to punish or prevent crimes and offences, and do not tend to lay a burden on the subject, either as aid or supply to His Majesty, or for any general or special purposes, by rates, tolls, assessments or otherwise.

Under rule 78 the Senate has no right to amend or to alter in any way a money Bill sent to them from this House. This House alone has the privilege of dealing with money Bills. The only right the Senate has is that of rejecting or assenting to such money Bills. That rule has been confirmed over and over again in England. The cases

to which rule 87 applies have reference to Bills coming from the Senate which deal in some way not with charges upon the revenue, but with penalties imposed upon the subject. I think, therefore, that my point of order is well taken; that the House has no power to assent to any alteration made by the Senate in a money Bill sent from this House to the Senate.

Mr. A. K. MACLEAN: I was going to suggest that in any event consideration of the Senate amendments to this Bill might be postponed until to-morrow. Personally, I could not follow very well the amendments as they were read by the minister. The first, I think, is rather unimportant; I doubt whether it changes materially the effect of the section. I refer to the addition of the word "net" in section 3. The second amendment is rather involved, and it was impossible to follow the sense of it from the reading of it by the minister. The last amendment, having reference to the proceedings of the tribunals created under the statute to hear appeals in camera, is a very important one.

I think, therefore, the House should have time to consider the matter before giving or refusing assent. I agree with the view the minister has taken in regard to the Senate amendments. He was inclined to agree to the same, because any other course might delay the proceedings of the House. If we deem it wise not to assent to the Senate amendments, the procedure is very simple: We refuse to agree to them. If that does not meet with favour in the Senate, a conference is possible. I rise chiefly to suggest that the consideration of the Senate amendments to this Bill be postponed until to-morrow, so that we may have an opportunity to look into them. It is quite possible the minister himself has not had an opportunity to give due consideration to them, and these amendments may substantially affect other sections.

Mr. SPEAKER: In respect to the point of order raised by the right hon. leader of the Opposition, it would appear from the opportunity I have had of looking into the matter, that it would be competent for this House to make a reservation such as was proposed by the Minister of Finance, because apparently, in May, 1874, we have a precedent in this Parliament. In the Journals of 1874 this entry is to be found with respect to a Bill entitled "An Act respecting the appropriation of certain Dominion lands in Manitoba," to which the Senate made certain amendments:

On motion of the Hon. Mr. Mackenzie, seconded by the Hon. Mr. Dorion, resolved, that this House doth concur in the said amendments; while doing so, it does not think it necessary, at this late period of the session, to insist on its privileges in respect thereto, but that the waiver of the said privileges in this case be not, however, drawn into a precedent.

Ordered, that the Clerk do carry back the Bill to the Senate, and acquaint their honours that this House hath agreed to their amendments.

Sir WILFRID LAURIER: Your Honour is not giving a ruling?

Mr. SPEAKER: No. Without giving a ruling upon the main point, I consider it would be competent for this House, if it so desires, by making a reservation, to avoid a precedent being created.

Sir WILFRID LAURIER: It so happens—

Mr. SPEAKER: Before giving a ruling, I would prefer to give the main question much more consideration than I have had opportunity to give it.

Sir WILFRID LAURIER: It so happens that in 1874, I was a member of this House. I was, of course, a very young member then, but I have a vague recollection of the discussion that took place. The Act was not an Appropriation Act; it was a Land Act. There was quite an important and lengthy debate as to whether or not the Act could be assimilated to the appropriation of money, and it was a dubious point whether or not a land grant came within the sole privilege of this House and it was on account of this uncertainty that the motion was passed reserving the rights of this House. It is forty years ago since that debate took place, but I think my recollection is correct, and if Your Honour will look into the matter, you will find that there was a discussion as to whether the land had been taken by appropriation or not.

Mr. SPEAKER: This is a very important matter. I shall take the earliest opportunity of going into the question quite fully, but I still hold the view that this House can preserve all its rights and privileges by a special statement to that effect.

Mr. CURRIE: I quite agree with the remarks of the leader of the Opposition. This is one of the ancient privileges of the House of Commons and I do not think it has been violated during the last forty years. It is the undoubted right of this House to originate all money Bills, and the Senate cannot add to, subtract from or vary any money Bill. For that reason, I

think, as the point is a very important one, we ought to adjourn the discussion so as to enable the Speaker to consult the authorities as is the custom in order that the rights of this House may be maintained. This is a very important right and, I do not think this House should agree to any change in its rights and privileges. We are putting up with a great deal from the Senate, and we shall have to put up with a great deal more if we give way in this case.

4 p.m.

Mr. PUGSLEY: I have before me Bourinot, who deals with the decision in regard to the Land Act of 1874. It will be found by an examination of Bourinot that in this case there was very grave doubt among the leaders of the House of Commons as to whether or not the Land Bill was really in the nature of a money Bill and whether this was an infringement of the rule. What the Senate did was to increase the land grants to settlers, and there was an uncertainty as to whether or not that was an infringement of the rule. It will never be doubted that if it was a clear infringement of rule 78, as this is, the House would have taken the course which it did. The question is one of the very gravest importance, because what is determined upon to-day is a precedent for to-morrow. I should think the resolution should not be passed simply upon the statement of the Minister of Finance that, in his opinion, it should not be a precedent. The House should have something to say with regard to the matter. The House might give notice to suspend rule 78 in order to allow the action of the Senate to be concurred in. That, however, would be a very grave thing to do.

Sir THOMAS WHITE: The considerations put forward here appealed to me, and I consulted the parliamentary counsel respecting them. It was drawn to my attention that in 1874 a Bill was returned from the Senate with an amendment providing for an increase in the quantity of land granted to settlers in the Northwest. That is the case which has been referred to. I quote from Bourinot, page 492:

> The Premier and other members doubted the right of the Senate to increase a grant of land—the public lands being, in the opinion of the House, in the same position as the public revenues. The amendment was only adopted with an entry in the Journals that the Commons did not think it "necessary, at that late period of the session, to insist on its privileges in respect thereto but that the waiver of the privileges was not to be drawn into a precedent."

It seemed to me, in view of the extreme importance of this Bill and the lateness of the session, as was the case in 1874, and as the amendments were not of vital importance, that we might adopt the same course that was then adopted, namely, concur in the amendments and reserve such privileges as the House has. As, however, the point of order has been raised, and as you, Sir, desire to have time to look up the authorities and give your ruling in respect of it, it would be a waste of time to continue the debate.

On the motion of Hon. Mr. Sévigny, the debate was adjourned.

WAR CHARITIES ACT.

House again in Committee on Bill No 130, relating to War Charities—Mr. Rainville in the Chair.

On section 3—Prohibition against raising money for war charities unless registered:

Mr. NESBITT: Would this section apply to the ordinary Red Cross Societies throughout the country?

Sir THOMAS WHITE: Yes.

Mr. NESBITT: What is the object of the Bill?

Sir THOMAS WHITE: The object of the Bill is to prevent frauds upon the public by people making appeals for real or alleged war charities. There has been considerable abuse along these lines, and this Bill is to remedy such abuse. I would point out to my hon. friend that no difficulty can arise in the case of well-established charities, because, by subsection 4 of section 3, the minister may exempt any war charity from registration under the Act. A well-established war charity would experience no difficulty under this measure.

Mr. NESBITT: I have not had an opportunity of reading the Bill, but it looks to me unnecessary to expose our Red Cross societies, which are in every village and hamlet in the country, to be prosecuted under an Act of Parliament. They are doing a great deal of good, and are generally carried on by the women. I suppose the Secretary of State may exempt Red Cross societies generally without particularizing them.

Sir THOMAS WHITE: Yes.

Mr. GRAHAM: Would this Bill cover the case of tag days? Sometimes we read of the proceeds of tag days being looted, which

would indicate that it is possible for people who had an ulterior object in view to institute a tag day under false pretenses, so to speak.

Sir GEORGE FOSTER: Those tag days must be authorized by the different municipalities.

Mr. NESBITT: No, not in all cases. There are hospital tag days, for instance—

Sir GEORGE FOSTER: But they have to get the permission of the municipal councils.

Mr. NESBITT: No.

Sir GEORGE FOSTER: They do in the cities.

Sir THOMAS WHITE: This applies only to appeals for the purpose of raising or attempting to raise money for any war charity by promoting any bazaar, sale, entertainment or exhibition, or by any similar means. On the face of it, I should say it would not apply to a tag day, because that is not the raising of money by a bazaar, sale, entertainment, or exhibition.

Mr. OLIVER: It does not seem to me that it has been made altogether clear just what object the Government desires to attain by this legislation. Clause (a) of subsection 1 of section 3 provides that the war charity is either exempt from registration or is registered under the Act. What are the conditions that exempt a war charity from registration? I have read clause (b) of subsection 1 several times and I am unable to understand what it is there for or what is intended to be accomplished by it. I would like the minister to say definitely what is the object sought to be attained.

Sir THOMAS WHITE: The purpose is to protect the public against appeals which, although purporting to be for war funds, may not as a matter of fact be for war funds but for the benefit of individuals. The Bill has a further object the placing of the organizations in this country which are appealing to the public for contributions in respect of war charities, within the knowledge of the Government. This, I think, is a very necessary step.

In Great Britain they have an Act similar to this. It has been necessary since the outbreak of the war to cause these war charities to be registered. Otherwise, my hon. friend will, I think, admit that it may be that we will have organizations purporting to be raising money for the war and in reality raising money for themselves. My remarks, of course, would not apply to a great fund such as the Patriotic Fund or the Red Cross Fund to whom the minister will, as a matter of course, grant exemption from registration. But it is thought advisable by the Government that it should be aware of these organizations making appeals for funds, and, secondly, that the public should be protected, in so far as it is possible to protect them by a legislative enactment such as this, from frauds which may be practised upon them.

Mr. PUGSLEY: Has it come to the knowledge of the minister that there have been any frauds practised to any extent in Canada since the war broke out?

Sir THOMAS WHITE: Not to my personal knowledge. There have been brought to my attention certain frauds in connection with the administration of a particular fund.

Mr. PUGSLEY: The objection I see to this is that it seems to interfere with those spontaneous efforts which are made by people all over the country by means of which large amounts have been raised since the war began. I take it that it would apply to fêtes where the people are invited to join together and contribute and where they do contribute. These innocent opportunities of raising money have resulted in very considerable sums being contributed. If it is proposed to prevent affairs of that kind without registering and obtaining the authority of the minister, it is going to interfere to a very considerable extent with those splendid spontaneous efforts which the people have been making since the war began.

Mr. NESBITT: I personally agree with the objects of the Bill because I think it is wise that there should be some regulation of these various charities that are gotten up. I suppose that organizations like the Daughters of the Empire and the Red Cross could be exempted as a whole and action would not be necessary for each particular section to secure exemption. Nearly all the charities are gotten up under the auspices of the Red Cross or the Daughters of the Empire. I suppose it will not interfere with any particular section acting under the association. It would appear to me as if the intent of the Bill is good if it does not interfere with that sort of organization. In reading it over, I do not see that it does.

Mr. MACDONALD: It must be conceded that since the war began there have been several instances where it would have been desirable if Government supervision or regu-

lation had occurred. At the beginning of the war some very enthusiastic person started to raise a fund to buy hospital ships. After this movement had gone along for awhile it was discovered that it was all nonsense, that there was no necessity for a hospital ship. The whole thing was the inspiration of some very worthy person who thought it would be a good idea. Then we had the idea propagated all over the country of getting up a subscription for machine guns. The newspapers proceeded on this question, and demands were made upon the public. Everybody who suggested that this was a matter that the Government ought to deal with, just as much as the supply of rifles, was pilloried as disloyal and guilty of all sorts of crimes and misdemeanours. A tremendous amount of money was collected all over the country and sent in to Ottawa and every now and then you hear of some municipality which wants to know what has become of the money. These movements were promoted by a species of hysteria, and that is what actuates similar efforts in a great many cases. It is a step in the right direction if the Bill is intended to prevent things of that kind. But when you say that:

> It shall not be lawful to make any appeal to the public for donations or subscriptions in money or in kind for any war charity as hereinbefore defined, or to raise or attempt to raise money for any such war charity by promoting any bazaar, sale, entertainment or exhibition, or by any similar means—

—unless the charity is exempt from registration or registration takes place under the Act, you are going too far. In my own part of the country, where battalions have been formed we have had the wives and relatives of the boys holding entertainments and making appeals to provide comforts for them and help them along. There was a Highland battalion raised in our province, the distinctive mark of which was the wearing of a feather in the bonnet, and in consequence of that the Blue Feather Club was organized. In every hamlet and village from which a few boys had gone they had entertainments and gatherings for the purpose of raising money. That is a sentiment that you could not interfere with, but it will be an absolute prohibitive thing to say to a number of people in a small place who want to get together to do something for the men who have gone to the front that they would be liable to a penalty unless they registered. Are a few people in some distant part of the Dominion, who desire to meet together for that purpose, to be held up until they apply to Ottawa to be registered or to secure permission to hold their entertainments? I do not know who is responsible for the drafting of them, but a great many of the Bills which have been presented to this House in the last week or two are Bills which require a great deal of changing before they can be deemed to be fit or proper legislation.

Sir THOMAS WHITE: Might I call my hon. friend's attention to the definition of the word "charity" which I think he has overlooked?

Mr. MACDONALD: The remarks I made were made in view of the definition of "war charities."

Sir THOMAS WHITE: It means any fund, institution or association.

Mr. MACDONALD: I will give you an illustration of the trouble we will have in Nova Scotia over the Blue Feather Club or the Red Feather Club. Technically, it would seem to be a club organized for the purpose of raising money, and it would come within the meaning of the Act. This measure is not well drafted. We know what the intention is in so far as it concerns the idea of regulating the inauguration of wholesale funds which are the development of some idea not based upon any proper consideration of the whole circumstances. That is one thing. That is what I think is the intent of the Act. But, we do not want every pie social and tea fight in the Dominion to be deemed illegal unless the promoters of those entertainments obtain registration under this Act. Yet, that is the way the Bill is drawn. Take the Bill in regard to the War-Time Elections Act which was introduced yesterday. I do not hesitate to say that that proposed legislation, in the way it is drafted and presented to the House, is a disgrace to the man who wrote it, considered as a piece of parliamentary drafting. It presents an elaboration of all the language which can be applied to create the greatest possible difficulty. The whole Bill ought to redrafted in order to get at the real intent.

Sir THOMAS WHITE: I do not agree with my hon. friend that this Act applies to every local attempt to raise money, owing to the definition of war charities. The definition is:

> Any fund, institution or association, whether established before or after the commencement of this Act, having for its object or among its objects the relief of suffering or distress, or

the supplying of needs or comforts to sufferers from the war, or to soldiers, returned soldiers or their families or dependents, or any other charitable purpose connected with the present European war.

By section 4, provision is made for local registration so that even in the case he mentions no difficulty would arise. The measure, I think, is in the public interest. I am informed that frauds have been perpetrated upon the public by appeals in aid of war charities, and there would seem to be no objection to the principle of the Bill. The minister is authorized to exempt any war charity from registration under the Act. That will save all the well-known funds and associations. Then a simple method is provided for registration locally so as to avoid difficulty to these associations of a minor character which are making local appeals in aid of war charities.

Mr. MARCIL: What does the minister mean by local registration? Is it registration with the registrar or municipal authorities? In my constituency there are ladies' clubs which hold entertainments and so on and send parcels to the boys at the front. Would an organization of that kind come under this Bill?

Sir THOMAS WHITE: If it is an association having certain definite objects as mentioned in section 2, it would. No difficulty could arise, because the minister could exempt that organization from registration under the Act. By section 4, the minister can appoint a local committee to attend to local registration. I do not apprehend any serious difficulty in connection with these associations which are bona fide carrying on the work of raising money or rendering assistance to war charities. The object of the Bill is to protect the public against associations which are not bona fide appealing to public sympathy. In framing an Act to protect the public in this way it is necessary to deal generally with associations making such appeals.

Mr. PARDEE: Does the minister not think that the churches would come under the definition of association?

Sir THOMAS WHITE: A church is not an association.

Mr. PARDEE: It is an institution. In fact I think it comes under both terms. Will it be necessary for each church to register or will the churches be subject to the penalty of $500 fine if they do not register? Supposing a church gives a large social purely for war purposes, under what section would it be exempt?

[Sir Thomas White.]

Sir THOMAS WHITE: Because of the definition of war purposes.

Mr. PARDEE: That is it is not formed for that purpose?

Sir THOMAS WHITE: Therefore it is not a charity.

Mr. PARDEE: I think that the framer of the Bill had something of this in mind, because on page 2 we have the section:

This section shall not apply to any collection at Divine service in a place of public worship.

Then what about the other collections of the church?

Sir THOMAS WHITE: I do not agree with my hon. friend, because certainly it is not the object of the church "to relieve suffering or distress——

Mr. MACDONALD: Oh yes it is.

Mr. McCRANEY: What church do you go to?

Sir THOMAS WHITE—"or the suffering of needs or comforts to sufferers from the war, or to returned soldiers and so on, or to any other charitable purpose connected with the present European war." That is not the object of the church.

Mr. MACDONALD: Oh yes.

Sir THOMAS WHITE: The church does that incidentally, but that is not the object of the church; and if a church which is organized for other objects incidentally assists in connection with the war, I should say that this Act does not apply to it.

Mr. GLASS: Nothing can more generally discourage public charity than frauds perpetrated upon the public in connection with charity, and experience during this war has shown that there have been occasions when unscrupulous organizations and people have made collections to defraud the public. I rather agree with the hon. member for Pictou (Mr. Macdonald) that this Bill, as drafted, does not nearly cover the objects intended. I do not deny that the objects in view are desirable and in some senses necessary, but the point raised by the hon. member for Lambton (Mr. Pardee) was in my mind before he spoke, that the very fact that, in subsection 2 of section 3, provision is made to exempt collections made at divine service, would seem to indicate that other collections by the church would not be exempted. It speaks of any fund, and it would seem that a fund collected by a church and set aside

especially for the purpose of war charity would be covered by the Act, and that registration would be necessary. My hon. friend from North Oxford (Mr. Nesbitt) has referred to such organizations as the Daughters of the Empire and others of a national character, which are recognized as responsible and whose energy throughout the whole of this war is greatly to be commended. Amendments might be made which would greatly improve the Bill in respect to such matters as have just been referred to, so that it should not apply to such organizations as the Daughters of the Empire, or to funds raised under the direction of a church organization.

I think it would put the churches to unnecessary trouble, and would, to some extent, retard voluntary efforts in charities, even if registration were necessary, or legal dispensation, or whatever might be provided. I think, generally speaking, organization for charities of this kind, where they are under the direct control of the church or under the direct control of some national organization such as the Daughters of the Empire, might be defined rigidly, and recognized branches of a national order of that kind might be properly defined. Notwithstanding that, I think we must admit that there is a real necessity for putting some curb on the efforts of unscrupulous individuals to collect funds from the public, presumably for purposes of war charities, and yet directly for the purpose of defrauding the public. I think the Bill, with the object it has in view is desirable, but I think it is crudely drawn to cover these objects, and would be a very troublesome Bill to administer. It might be amended in committee to cover the necessities of the case. In its present shape, I do not think it meets the requirements of the country.

Mr. GRAHAM: It may be that, in a measure, I should assume some responsibility for the introduction of this Bill, because in the discussion I think, of the taxation proposals I made the statement that there ought to be some regulation of the various appeals to the people. It appeared that too many people were passing the hat, and that all the good was not accomplished that might be accomplished by constant appeals to the people for a little subscription to this and a little subscription to that, some contributors who might give large amounts being satisfied with giving but very little to minor subscriptions. I agree with a good deal that has been said, and I do not know the legal effect of the Bill, but there should be some measure of this kind, because I think it is, perhaps, more necessary this year than in former years. All the money we can raise should be devoted to the exact purpose for which the people intended it, namely, to carry on our charities, as well as our taxation contribution. There is a class of people—and they flourish very well under present conditions—who make a living by proposing to some of the local organizations to get up an entertainment for some purpose. The promoter of the entertainment will perhaps get 50 per cent and the local people 50 per cent, but the local people will pay the expenses.

Mr. NESBITT: Sixty—forty.

Mr. GRAHAM: The whole population takes part day after day, and night after night, and spend a lot of money privately getting ready for these things, with the result that when the returns come in the promoter gets $500, the expenses are $300 and the charity receives perhaps $200. These things should be submitted to some authority to say what the terms are to be, and the conditions under which these entertainments are carried on, so that the people who contribute largely from the goodness of their heart, believing the money will go into some public good, will know that, outside of regular ordinary legitimate expenses, the money will go for the purposes to which they contributed it. I am in hearty accord with the purposes of the Bill, and I leave it to the legal gentlemen to get it in proper shape.

Sir THOMAS WHITE: Subsection (b) of section 2 provides that any question as to whether a charity is a war charity shall be finally determined by the minister.

Mr. MACDONALD: I should like to find a precedent for putting in the interpretation clause the words "any question whether a charity is a charity shall be finally determined by the minister."

Sir THOMAS WHITE: I think it is in the Customs Act, and in certain of our taxation Acts. Such a question is often left to the minister, who is responsible to the Government, and the Government is responsible to the public, and no impropriety or irregularity is likely to result. It is difficult to specifically define by legislation what a war charity is. In order to prevent any hardship it is provided that the matter is finally left to the discretion of the minister. If a question arises as to whether a church is an association coming within subsection (b) of section 2, it is for the minister to determine. My

own view would be that, so far as the ordinary denominations are concerned, no question can arise. The minister would determine whether or not they were organizations having for their object the matters mentioned in this subsection. It might occur that an association calling itself a church was collecting money improperly, and I think it should be for the minister to determine, in that case, whether it came under this Act or not. I think the House should assume that it would not be the object of the Government to make this Act an engine of oppression against these associations that are engaged in the laudable and most meritorious work of assisting sufferers in this war. But the Act would be administered in such a way as to prevent fraud, and at the same time not to retard the beneficial work of the Red Cross, Patriotic Fund, and the churches engaged in such charitable work and honestly administering any funds coming into their possession. If the House is to assume the minister will use this in some way oppressively, we could make an amendment to the Bill, but with the decision left in the hands of the minister, I think there would be no difficulty in working it out.

Mr. MACDONALD: This interpretation clause, which is the key note of the whole Act, is intended to deal with money which is used for the purpose of giving relief to those in suffering or in distress, or the supplying of needs or comforts to sufferers from the war, or to soldiers, returned soldiers, or their families or dependents, or any other charitable purpose connected with the present European war.

Moreover, the Bill leaves out of consideration the men who have enlisted in the Naval Service. Does the minister not think that the word "charity" is not a happy word to use in connection with work of this kind done for the soldiers?

Mr. NICKLE: "Benevolence" would be a better word.

Mr. MACDONALD: I object to the use of the word "charity" as descriptive of the work of organizations the object of which is to supply comforts to the soldiers. The people who do this work have not in their mind any idea of charity. This interpretation clause does not go far enough. It ought to provide that any fund organized in connection with war purposes should be subject to regulation and control. You do not need to regulate organizations whose members send socks and other comforts to the soldiers; you need to regulate the activities of men and women who decide to get up new funds for purposes alleged to be in connection with the war.

Sir THOMAS WHITE: I think the word "fund" would cover that.

Mr. MACDONALD: No, it would not. The interpretation clause is intended to regulate the activities of people whose work does not need any regulation. The persons who need regulation are those who say: We want to get up a fund to build a ship, present a gun—something of that kind, which has nothing to do with supplying needs or comforts to soldiers on service or returned soldiers.

Mr. NESBITT: I agree with my hon. friend in so far as his remarks relate to the raising of funds for ships and that kind of thing, but I do not agree that we should not regulate the so-called charitable organizations operated by people who collect subscriptions from individuals. We ought to control their activities in some way; I think that this Bill does cover such cases.

Mr. PUGSLEY: Subsection 2 of section 3 of this Bill provides:

> This section shall not apply to any collection at divine service in a place of public worship.

This shows that all other work done by a church in the way of so-called war charities comes under the provisions of this Bill. The word "institution," therefore, as contained in the definition clause, is intended to include religious denominations.

Sir THOMAS WHITE: Assuming that that is so—though I do not agree with my hon. friend—it does not appear to me that churches should be specially exempted. I stated some time ago that so far as ordinary denominations were concerned, I could not conceive how any question could arise; any fund that they would institute would be honestly and properly administered. But an association connected with some church might not so make its appeal or administer money raised; consequently I see no objection to bringing churches within the purview of the Act. The minister may exempt any war charity from registration under the Act. He may exempt, for example, the Presbyterian Church, the Methodist Church, the Roman Catholic Church, just as he can exempt the Red Cross or the Patriotic Fund.

Mr. McKENZIE: What does the minister say about that very worthy body, the Salvation Army? Suppose they held a concert

for the relief of returned soldiers; would they come within this definition?

Sir THOMAS WHITE: I have no hesitation in saying that the minister would exempt them if necessary, because they are, as my hon. friend has said, a worthy body.

Mr. McKENZIE: They should not—nor should any religious body of that kind—be left open to prosecution.

Sir THOMAS WHITE: If my hon. friend will look at section 10, subsection 2, he will find the following:

> Proceedings for offences against this Act, other than offences against section nine, shall not be instituted except with the consent of the minister.

Mr. PUGSLEY: Surely you would not want a clergyman to be liable to imprisonment.

Sir THOMAS WHITE: My hon. friend is raising many bogeys in connection with this legislation.

Mr. PUGSLEY: It is so absurd in some respects.

Sir THOMAS WHITE: I do not agree with my hon. friend. Nearly all legislation that is introduced is absurd to him, so that he may not be surprised if I do not take his view as to what is absurd or what is not absurd.

Mr PUGSLEY: An hon. gentleman on the other side of the House, who spoke very clearly on the subject, came pretty near to calling this Bill as drafted an absurd one.

Sir THOMAS WHITE: The hon. gentleman did not use the word "absurd." He argued the matter very temperately; I think that he had not read the Bill through.

Mr. MACDONALD: Why should this Bill not be entitled: An Act relating to War Collections?

Sir THOMAS WHITE: The whole Bill would have to be redrafted in that case.

Mr. MACDONALD: I think that the description "war charities" is unfortunate. Provision ought to be made in the definition clause for the application of the Act to sailors. The word "charitable" should be struck out. The minister would then have power to deal with organizations or individuals collecting money for any purpose connected with the European war. If the word "collection" were used, or some other appropriate word, the Bill would be in much better shape.

Mr. MARCIL: I support the view of the hon. member for Pictou. I have had an opportunity on certain occasions of addressing public meetings in support of the Patriotic Fund, and I have always impressed upon my hearers that anything we were giving to the soldier or his family was not to be considered in the light of charity, but that it was well earned and well deserved on account of the services the soldier was performing for his country. The soldiers themselves would not be pleased to hear that any organization was extending "charity" to them. The word is badly chosen.

Sir THOMAS WHITE: There is an objection to applying the word "charity" to assistance given to our soldiers. This Bill goes much further—it refers to the relief of suffering, of distress, or the supplying of needs or comforts to sufferers from the war. It applies to the raising of money, for sufferers in Belgium, and that is clearly a charity. This Bill applies to appeals of which there are many in this country. The Red Cross Fund——

Mr. MACDONALD: That is not charity.

Sir THOMAS WHITE: It would apply to the Red Cross Fund whose operations extend to all the countries of the Allies; it would apply, for instance, to appeals for the orphans of Serbia, Poland, or Russia.

Mr. MARCIL: The Armenians.

Sir THOMAS WHITE: It would apply to appeals on behalf of Armenians. Clearly, there is no better term than the word "charity" in that connection. The assistance we give to our soldiers from the Patriotic Fund, of course, should not be regarded as charity. The word "charity," however, is a good English word, properly applicable to an organization the object of which is to relieve sufferers in distress, let us say, in Belgium, Armenia, Poland, or any other country. It is only playing upon words to object to the term.

Mr. PUGSLEY: The Minister of Finance took objection to the use of the word "absurd" by which I characterized a portion of this Bill. The minister will remember that I was dealing with the section which provides for a penalty, and it was intimated that a clergyman or the officer of a church, might be liable. The minister stated there would be no difficulty about that because there could be no prosecution without the consent of the Secretary of

State. I said that it was absurd to say that would be a satisfactory provision. That is what I meant. When one takes the ground that a clergyman or the officers of a church might be liable under this measure because the organization not being registered some money was being solicited for the Red Cross work or for the Patriotic Fund or for any other work connected with the war, is it not absurd to say that no harm would be done because such persons could not be prosecuted without the consent of the Secretary of State? Under such circumstances a clergyman or the officers of the church might be liable to a fine not exceeding $500 or to imprisonment with or without hard labour for a term not exceeding three months. In other words, the man would become a criminal under the statute, but he could not be prosecuted without the consent of the Secretary of State. That would be an unenviable position in which to place a clergyman or an officer of a church who sought to do his part in regard to the collection of contributions for war purposes. I do not hesitate to repeat what I said, namely, that the Bill has not been properly drafted to meet the evil which it has been suggested is the reason for it. The Minister of Finance when he first spoke on the Bill, said that it was not intended to include churches——

Sir THOMAS WHITE: That is my view.

Mr. PUGSLEY: —because, he said, a church was not an institution. Yet when we come to section 3 of the Bill, we find that the work a church may do without being registered is limited to one thing, that is to say, money may be collected at Divine service in a place of public worship and the church would not be liable because it was not registered, but all other war charity work which its members may carry on would be illegal and would render the clergymen and officers of the church liable to a penalty of $500 or imprisonment with or without hard labour for a term not exceeding three months. That shows very clearly, no matter what the Minister of Finance may think, that the draughtsman had in mind that a church would be an institution within the meaning of paragraph (b) of section 2. That is absolutely clear by virtue of the limitation contained in section 3.

Mr. NICKLE: It was only a day or two ago that I was speaking to one of the leading representatives of the Great War Veterans Association, and he was urging upon me that steps should be taken by this House to pass some Bill along the line of the measure now under consideration. He said that certain people throughout this country were taking advantages of the sympathies the people had with returned soldiers to make collections under the guise or allegation that the money was to be spent on behalf of the men who had returned or who had been injured. He urged that steps should be taken immediately to prevent what he thought was a growing grievance. There are none of us who are not aware of the fact that from one end of the country to the other, there has been a great deal of money very unwisely collected, although I must readily admit that the spontaneous response of the people to requests that merit consideration has been most commendable. If I understand the object of this Bill, it does not purport to deal with collections on behalf of what one might call war purposes; it simply deals with collections for charitable purposes. It does not include collections for field kitchens or machine guns for our troops.

Mr. MACDONALD: Why should it not?

Mr. NICKLE: The object of this Bill is to deal with war charities or war benevolence; it in no way deals with the collection of money for war purposes. I do not think my hon. friend opposite is sincere in his objection that under this Bill any honest person who collects without having the authority stipulated for in this Bill would be considered a criminal. Surely, if some minister, in his zeal, but without knowledge of this Bill assuming that it should become law, were to institute a collection, no one for a moment would think of considering him a criminal.

Mr. MACDONALD: Suppose a minister started a fund and he has certain members in his congregation who did not approve of it—that has often occurred and more hostility is aroused in churches that way than in anything else—an opportunity might be given to malcontents to have the minister prosecuted.

Mr. NICKLE: If my hon. friend were the Secretary of State he would say there should be no prosecution.

Mr. MACDONALD: At the same time the church would be torn asunder on the question as to whether the minister were guilty or innocent.

Mr. PUGSLEY: Should a man's guilt or innocence depend on the whim of the Secretary of State?

Mr. NICKLE: His guilt or innocence does not depend upon the whim of the Secretary of State. The Secretary of State decides whether there shall be a prosecution. Whether we can improve the Act by changing a word here and there is a matter for consideration. No man who has been close to war collections throughout this country can fail to appreciate that the time has come when there should be some regulation and control of those collections, and that the Government being the responsible authority should take cognizance of and give sanction to those collections before they are made.

Mr. OLIVER: I am very much in sympathy with the stated object of the Bill, and very much in sympathy with the statement just made by my hon. friend (Mr. Nickle). The difficulty is that the Bill is not in accordance with his statement. Either the Bill should require the registration of all effort towards war charity, or it should not require such registration. Subsection 1 provides for registration, and provides for no registration. I do not know at all what the next succeeding subsection provides for. If the Government thinks it wise to put a limitation upon collections for war charities, let them say so, and let them provide for that registration, but do not let them say in one breath "you must register," and in the next breath, or in fact in the same breath say "you need not register." Let us have an understanding that there will be a fair deal in this matter, so that there may not be two organizations of benevolent people in a certain place, one securing the authority of the minister, and the other failing to do so. I think we should have some definite statement of what the Government means.

Sir THOMAS WHITE: The Bill speaks for itself.

Mr. OLIVER: But, as I read the Bill, it does not give me any indication of what the Government is going to do in any particular case. I submit it is not legislation which is worthy of this House or of the Government. There is no reason why the time of the House should be taken up by the discussion of a Bill of this character. The Government has ample power under the War Measures Act to make regulations covering this point, and there is no reason why that should not be done. I cannot understand why the Government should come to Parliament with a Bill of this kind. I want to ask in regard to a specific matter. Some time ago I had the honour of bringing to the attention of the House the operations of a gentleman named Merritt, who is collecting ostensibly for the supplying of aeroplanes to the Imperial authorities. I would like to know if the Government has any knowledge of this gentleman's operations, and if they are such as would be subject to registration under this Bill, and if the Government would give them registration.

Sir GEORGE FOSTER: The question with reference to Colonel Merritt was asked yesterday. Colonel Merritt has certain views as to the advisability of building aeroplanes in Canada and presenting them to the Imperial Government. In conjunction with others who hold the same views he is attempting to raise money for the building of those aeroplanes. If he and others, men of wealth and of substance, consider it is a wise thing to do, and are willing to put their money into it, it is perfectly legitimate for them to do so. Colonel Merritt also had the idea that the Government might make a certain contribution towards this purpose, either by giving a number of aeroplanes, or in such other way as they might consider advisable. After discussing the matter with him, the Government came to the conclusion that their burdens in munitioning and equipping for war were quite as great as they could handle and they did not think it was their part to assist in helping to make this presentation of aeroplanes to the Imperial authorities. That is where the matter rests.

Mr. OLIVER: That is a very definite instance in point. The Minister of Trade and Commerce has made a very clear statement in regard to this matter, and I desire to ask the Minister of Finance if this enterprise of Colonel Merritt's is such as would require to be registered under this Bill.

Sir THOMAS WHITE: No, because it is not a war charity.

Mr. OLIVER: If the securing of aeroplanes for presentation to the Government is not a war charity, I am at a loss to understand the meaning of words.

Sir THOMAS WHITE: A war charity has for its object or among its objects the relief of suffering or distress or the supplying of needs or comforts to sufferers from the war, or to soldiers, returned soldiers, or their families or dependents, or any other charitable purpose connected with the present European war. The object of Colonel

Merritt does not come under the definition of "charitable" as set forth in the Bill.

Mr. OLIVER: "Any other charitable purpose" would surely cover the contribution of aeroplanes.

Sir THOMAS WHITE: No. There is a rule of law that would apply there.

Mr. MACDONALD: If the minister is legislating on the subject at all, does he not think he should legislate so that the Government would exercise some supervision over an enterprise such as colonel Merritt's which may be a very worthy one indeed. Colonel Merritt's scheme is a necessary and wise one, or forms part of the necessary preparation for the conduct of the war, why should not the Government itself take the initiative in it? The fact that nothing has been done is only an evidence of lack of understanding and neglect on the part of the Government in dealing with this whole war problem. The Government simply says: "If some gentleman outside wants to go ahead and do this thing, we do not propose to interfere with him." It simply stands aside with dilettante indifference, and does not regulate it or express any opinion about it, but if somebody wants to get up a pie social, away in the backwoods, in order to provide socks for the soldiers, the Government will regulate that. I instanced the case of the hospital ship. Every one knows it was a most tremendous farce that this whole country should be appealed to to give money for a hospital ship which was not needed and for which there was no place. The same thing applies to the machine guns. If aeroplanes are needed, why should not the Government undertake the supplying of them? This seems so elementary that I am surprised the Government does not see it.

Sir THOMAS WHITE: This Bill simply covers war charities. It does not go any further than that. Whether another Bill should be brought in dealing with the question to which my hon. friend refers, or whether that matter if dealt with at all should be dealt with under the War Measures Act, is not now before the committee.

Mr. McKENZIE: I am not familiar with the evils to the country which necessitated the bringing forward of this Bill. In the part of Canada from which I come we have very active associations in connection with matters which this Bill would call, I suppose, war charities. Everything that could be done in the way of Red Cross associations, and for the benefit of our soldiers,

has engaged our attention from the commencement of the war. I never heard of any abuses in regard to the moneys so collected, and I am more or less at a loss to know why it was necessary to bring forward legislation of this kind.

Perhaps the minister has given some instances of abuse which this Parliament should legislate to curb and, if possible, to prevent. It is with a condition of this kind that we have to deal, I presume, when we enact a criminal law such as this is; if there are any abuses in connection with the moneys that are collected we have the criminal law. We are not confined to the Criminal Code but the criminal common law of England is in force here, we had it in force before the code was enacted and it is still in force where the code does not apply. If any person takes money collected for the purposes of the war, or for the soldiers, and applies it to something else, he must have received the money under false pretenses. Suppose he puts on an entertainment which he says is for the purpose of getting money for the soldiers and suppose, after he gets that money, he applies it to some purpose of his own; that is a criminal offence under the provision of our Criminal Code which says that if he receives money under false pretenses he is subject to be dealt with under the code. If he intended at the time he gave the entertainment to apply the money properly and afterwards changed his mind and used it for something else, he is guilty of theft. I make these statements as a lawyer of some age and experience. Any body of individuals engaging in a proceeding of that kind is open to prosecution if any person chooses to lay an information against it. When we have a condition of that kind, and when we have a law well understood, it seems to me that we are putting in an extra wheel here which rather complicates matters and makes it very difficult to deal with such a condition. It is almost impossible to make a safe definition. We have all these definitions in the law which have gone through the mill a thousand times, almost every word of which has received judicial interpretation, and it is rather dangerous to be starting out anew upon sidetracks of this kind. Under section 3, if any person gives an entertainment of any kind, he is liable. I attended a Sunday school entertainment not very long ago where the teachers and pupils got together and had lantern slides. That innocent entertainment of the Sunday school was for the purpose of getting money to buy boxes of stuff

they were sending across to the soldiers. Under this law the Sunday school teachers who gave that innocent entertainment are subject to prosecution, and every person who took a hand in it may be imprisoned for three months in the county jail or may have to pay a fine not exceeding $500. It seems to me that we are putting a ponderous piece of machinery in motion to meet evils that are largely imaginary as far as I know, having regard to the province from which I come. I have not heard a murmur anywhere about the misapplication of any funds that were collected. I submit that this is introducing a new element that is capable of abuse. It will retard the holding of these useful entertainments and discourage the very proper efforts that are being put forth. You might frighten people by telling them that after this Act is passed, if they do anything of this kind, they are subject to prosecution. It is useless to say: They may start to prosecute you, but the Secretary of State can stop it. I think this is absolutely a work of supererogation, and that it is applying criminal legislation where there is no necessity for it and applying it in a dangerous way, the far-reaching effect of which has not been properly comprehended.

Mr. GLASS: I cannot agree with my hon. friend (Mr. McKenzie) that because the Criminal Code provides for the punishment of individuals who may defraud the public in this way, the Criminal Code can be entirely relied upon to meet the needs of every case that may arise. An organization may be promulgated to collect a certain fund for a purpose which might come under this Act. The collections might spread over considerable time. While the Criminal Code provides that punishment may be meted out to those who are responsible for a fraud, it certainly is a deterrent to voluntary charity to know that the law will permit such fraud to be perpetrated before it can be dealt with. We have discussed this Bill all afternoon, and I take it from the statements which have appeared in the press and otherwise that the general consensus of opinion is that it is desirable. We have had from the Minister of Finance (Sir Thomas White) the opinion that under clause 2, churches may be exempt. I cannot see why it is necessary in so much legislation to adopt the cross-eyed method of not saying what you mean or meaning what you say. If the minister thinks that churches are exempt under this, why not remove the ambiguity and make it clear?

Mr. PUGSLEY: Hear, hear.

Mr. GLASS: The minister does not think the Bill perfect. It comes from the Senate and from the discussion this afternoon it is evident that we are not all of the opinion that it is as it should be. In its present form it will be cumbersome and troublesome to the great church organizations of this country. I respectfully ask the minister why, if churches are not to be included, an exception in their case should not be inserted in subsection (b), perhaps by adding " excepting churches or church organizations." I presume that a church organization would cover the Salvation Army. Would that not meet many of the objections? The churches should not have to apply to the Secretary of State, and the minister should exempt the churches and such comprehensive organizations throughout Canada. Why can we not put that exemption right in the Bill, and so fix it once for all and avoid any ambiguity or doubt?

Sir THOMAS WHITE: There is no objection to doing it. My own view is that the Bill does not apply to churches, for the reason I mentioned, but if there is any doubt the matter could be dealt with by inserting the words " other than churches " after the word " association." But just as soon as you begin to limit you raise difficulties. That is almost a maxim of drafting. I would suggest that section 2 be allowed to stand.

Mr. McKENZIE: I object to this. No doubt the minister is preparing for closure.

Sir THOMAS WHITE: No, I am not; not on this Bill.

Mr. McKENZIE: I object to allowing any basis for closure, and I think this section should be disposed of.

Mr. PUGSLEY: This motion to stand is a very dangerous motion.

Sir THOMAS WHITE: I shall consider whether it is necessary to make an amendment to exclude churches, which I think is the intention of the measure.

Mr. MACDONALD: I was going to suggest that the words " war contribution " should be used instead of " war charity," and that subsection (b) of section 2 should be amended by substituting " contribution " for " charity " in the 11th line, and that the 17th line should be amended by striking out the word " charitable " so as to give jurisdiction over associations formed for

any other purpose. My hon. friend would get jurisdiction over all funds in that way.

Mr. McKENZIE: Is it the intention that before commencing, say, a bazaar to collect money for war purposes, application should be made to the minister and a permit secured? It says that the final determination as to whether anything is for war purposes should be made by the minister.

Sir THOMAS WHITE: Only a fund, institution or association established for the purposes mentioned in (b) would have to obtain registration before it could promote a bazaar. All promoters of bazaars or other entertainments would not be liable. Then by subsection 4 provision is made for local registration, so that no hardship could result in any case.

The hon. member for Pictou (Mr. Macdonald) suggests using the word "contribution" instead of "charity." He has not read the section carefully. Charity has two meanings; sometimes it is used as in this Act in the sense of the organization that is engaged in charitable work. You often speak of organizing a charity. That is derivative, because the objects of the association are charitable. But we call the organization itself a charity. It is the organization that is called a charity here.

Mr. McKENZIE: If the minister wants to define charity, Paul has given a very full definition, and I would warn the minister not to conflict with what is so well understood and so well defined by Paul.

Mr. MACDONALD: What does Paul say?

Mr. McKENZIE: The minister will learn.

Sir THOMAS WHITE: Charity begins at home.

Mr. McKENZIE: Not exactly.

Sir THOMAS WHITE: We had better not introduce Paul into this assembly. I am afraid he would feel strangely out of place in association with the hon. member for Cape Breton. The suggestion of the hon. member for Pictou does not appeal to me, for the reason that the word "charity" is here used for the organization, and to substitute the word "contribution" would not meet the case, whereas the word "contribution" might in some cases be almost synonymous with "charity" in one sense of the meaning, it would not meet this case where the word applied to an organization. Personally, I think that most of the objections to the Bill are rather fanciful. The hon. member for Cape Breton (Mr. McKenzie) has referred to the criminal law. The criminal law is useful to obtain punishment of offenders after offences have been committed. The object of this legislation is to prevent the commission of the offence. My hon. friend's suggestion is to lock the door after the horse is stolen. Our object is to prevent the stealing of the horse.

Mr. OLIVER: Is the purpose to prevent the collection of the money, or to prevent the improper diversion of it?

Sir THOMAS WHITE: To prevent improper organizations attempting to collect, and also to prevent diversion of the money. In the first place, if application is made to the minister by an organization as to which he is dubious, he would make inquiries under the provisions of the Act, and probably, if he came to the conclusion the organization was not one which should be allowed to appeal for funds, he would not grant registration. It is entirely in the judgment of the minister to say whether he will grant registration or exemption from registration. It seems to me the Act is hedged about by every safeguard that can be suggested.

Mr. OLIVER: It seems to me there could be no improper organizations that collect for war charities. The only impropriety that could possibly occur is that the money might not be sent to the war charities. It is inconceivable that there could be any impropriety in collecting money for a war charity.

Sir THOMAS WHITE: It depends upon the intention.

Mr. OLIVER: If the money is collected for a war charity there is by no possibility, any impropriety in that act. The only impropriety that can be connected with it is that the money, after being collected, is diverted from the charity. It seems to me that is a point the Government might very well have concentrated its attention upon; but in undertaking to pass judgment on the good intentions of any man or woman or set of men or women who are undertaking a project that of itself is essentially and necessarily good, he is certainly taking a very serious responsibility, and however much confidence my hon. friend has in the omniscience of the Secretary of State I have not the same confidence in his omniscience to foresee what the intent of any body of men or women is when they are undertaking to do what is a laudable and legitimate act.

Sir THOMAS WHITE: My hon. friend speaks of a laudable and legitimate act.

The question of intention is of importance in that connection. Let us assume that some person, designing fraud upon a community, forms an association to appeal to the public for the charitable purposes mentioned in this Act. Will my hon. friend say that enterprise is laudable? Does not the question of intention count. The purpose of this Bill is to prevent organizations of that character appealing to the public throughout Canada. In that way, if the Act is carried out, only those organizations that have official sanction through registration, in other words proper organization, will be allowed to appeal to the public, whose sympathies can be enlisted readily in any project that promises aid to sufferers during this war. If hon. gentlemen desire to take up time discussing the Bill, I am willing to sit and listen, but I must confess that the arguments put forward by hon. members do not appear to me to be well founded, if the principle of the Bill is sound, namely that it is the duty of the public in war time to protect the public from appeals to their sympathy that may be made by parties who are not disinterested, but who are seeking to promote their own advantage, and to divert funds which were raised for certain worthy purpose to other purposes.

Mr. KNOWLES: I do not know just how far the Act goes, and I desire information. I know that a great many lectures were given on the prairies this year, in towns where there was no Red Cross and no organization of any kind. I gave quite a number myself. Collections were taken up at these entertainments, and were sent to the nearest Red Cross or Patriotic Fund, or devoted to purposes as the local people thought fit.

Mr. PUGSLEY: They would be liable to a fine of $500, under this Bill if they were not registered.

Mr. KNOWLES: The minister does not intend taking action against these people, and I am satisfied no person will make trouble for them. But it is not wise to enact laws that will, even in a good cause, be broken. It is quite a common thing for young people on the prairies to have their evening entertainment. They dance at these places, and charge a fee each evening to those who dance, and, after all the expenses are paid, the money goes to charitable purposes. They sometimes make $60 and $70 a night, and they send it to Moosejaw or Regina as the case may be. A large amount of money has been contributed in that way. I remember a Conservative candidate in the provincial election in Saskatchewan could not get an audience, and he announced that there would be a dance, and basket social for the Red Cross. They held the meeting, had the dance, held an auction, and sold off the baskets. They got $150, and they had the time of their lives getting the $150 from the Conservative gentleman, who held the bag with the money. However, that was not the fault of the association. Perhaps the hon. minister will make provision to prevent cases of that kind occurring. Will the minister say if these entertainments would be prohibited by the Act?

Sir THOMAS WHITE: I would say that is not an association having for its object the purposes mentioned in this Bill. This measure would not prevent parties getting up social or other entertainments, on certain occasions.

Mr. KNOWLES: That is all I wanted to know.

Mr. PUGSLEY: The difficulty is that the Bill does this extraordinary thing: it mixes up the money that is raised with the institution that raises it. Charity is defined to be a fund, an institution, or an association. Therefore, under this, a church organization is a charity within the meaning of the Act, and a temperance organization is a charity. The individual fund becomes a charity. It seems to me the Act ought to define charity to be the fund which is raised. Let that be the charity, and let the organization be entirely separate and distinct from that. One of the difficulties about this Bill is the confusion caused by the minister attempting to give one meaning both to the money which is raised and to the institution which raises it. You cannot do that, and make a satisfactory Bill. That is the reason why my hon. friend cannot accept the amendment of the hon. member for Pictou (Mr. Macdonald) that the title of the Bill should be "An Act relating to War Contributions." It would be very much better to use the words "War Charities," and to define war charities to mean the funds which are raised for the objects to which the money may be devoted. Let the institutions be an entirely different thing. Then I would exempt churches. and generally religious organizations. There is no reason in the world why they should be compelled to register.

It would be unwise to place the pastor or other officials of a church who raise money for the Patriotic Fund, the Red Cross Fund, or for other war purposes, in the position of criminals simply because they fail to ob-

tain registration. The member for Moosejaw (Mr. Knowles) mentioned a case that has occurred frequently and that will occur very often in the future: people hold public meetings and collections are taken up for charitable purposes. If in such cases no registration is made, a criminal offence is committed and the persons in charge of the meeting are liable to a penalty not exceeding $500 or to imprisonment for a period not exceeding three months.

Sir THOMAS WHITE: I do not agree with my hon. friend in that.

Mr. PUGSLEY: The gentleman who drafted the Bill seemed to think that that would be the result, because he specially exempts collections made at churches during divine service. The fair inference is that the meaning of the draftsman was —I am satisfied that this would be the meaning attached to the Act by any court —that except in cases where collection was made during divine service, persons making collections for these purposes without registration would be criminally liable under this statute. It is true that they could not be prosecuted without the consent of the minister, but it is one thing to be amenable to the criminal law and another to be saved from prosecution through the kindness or the sympathy of the minister. I do not think that any person should become criminally liable for acts which are thoroughly laudable in their character and which should be praised instead of being punished. The minister ought to do as suggested by the amendment of the member for Pictou: make this Act relate to war contributions. Give a definition to war contributions; do not mix up the contribution with the organization which may be the means of collecting the money. I think also that the hon. gentleman should accept the reasonable suggestion of the member for East Middlesex (Mr. Glass). All members of the committee will give full credit to the member for East Middlesex for a desire to make the Bill as perfect as possible. If the minister will accept these suggestions, I am sure that he will in the end have a statute which will bring about the desired object. If he insists on the Bill going through in its present form, a good deal of confusion will result; many people will find themselves in the class of criminal offenders, although their sole object may have been to do their best in the way of collecting money for charitable purposes connected with the war.

[Mr. Pugsley.]

Sir THOMAS WHITE: One reason why I find myself unable to accept the suggestions of the member for Pictou and the member for St. John that the Act should apply to contributions and not to charities, is that such an amendment would change the entire purpose of the Act. This Act is not directed at contributions; it is to regulate organizations appealing for contributions, and to these organizations the general name "charities" is given, because their objects are charitable.

Mr. PUGSLEY: If the Bill is intended to apply to organizations, why is the word "fund" used? Surely a fund is very different from an organization.

Sir THOMAS WHITE: My hon. friend is altogether too intelligent to be deceived for one moment by his own argument in that respect. He knows that the word "fund" has two meanings, just as the word "charity" has two meanings. A fund may relate to the money possessed by an organization; on the other hand, the organization may be called a fund. For example, The Patriotic Fund is the name of an organization; The Red Cross Fund is the name of an organization. Therefore there is no ambiguity in including the word "fund" in the term "War Charities." In this Act the organizations are dealt with, not the contributions which these organizations may obtain. We have had a wide, edifying, and somewhat desultory discussion of this Bill. One thing we have succeeded in doing: we have used up the time of the committee from 3.30 to 6—which may be a desirable thing to do at this time. It is not my intention to go on with this Bill this evening; I therefore move that the committee rise, report progress, and ask leave to sit again. In the meantime, I shall be glad to consider whether the amendment suggested by the member for East Middlesex with regard to the matter of exemption to churches is necessary. Personally, I do not think it is.

Mr. PUGSLEY: I am sorry, indeed, that the minister, in taking the very laudable step of asking the committee to rise in order that the amendments suggested, particularly that of the member for East Middlesex, may be considered, should have recurred to his habit of scolding the members of the committee. My hon. friend says that we have succeeded in occupying the time of the committee since half-past three. What are we consulted by the minister for? Why does he submit these Bills for our consideration? If my hon. friend feels that we

are doing wrong in having any discussion of these matters, I suggest to him that he have the Rules of the House amended to provide that it shall not be necessary to submit Bills to the consideration of the Committee of the Whole House; that they shall be passed at the pleasure and upon the dictum of the Government. In this way a great deal of time would be saved, and the will of the Government could be carried out to the satisfaction of my hon. friend.

Sir GEORGE FOSTER: There is no doubt that time would be saved.

Mr. PUGSLEY: The minister should take that suggestion into consideration.

Sir THOMAS WHITE: The Committee of the Whole has its uses, and the member for St. John is able, as well as any member of the House, to bear an important and useful part in debate—when that is his object. Whether that was his object this afternoon when he was splitting hairs over the definition of the words "charities" and "fund," I leave to his own good judgment and to the judgment of the committee. Personally, I have no objection to any remarks that the hon. gentleman may make in regard to the Bill, but I do think a large portion of the afternoon was wasted in discussing matters that were not in the essence, so far as the Bill is concerned. On the other hand, some suggestions were made that are well worthy of consideration.

Mr. McKENZIE: Do I understand that section 2 is to stand, subject to the introduction of certain amendments?

Sir THOMAS WHITE: Subject to consideration.

Mr. McKENZIE: And some amendement is to be introduced, I understand?

Sir THOMAS WHITE: Possibly.

Mr. McKENZIE: Then my hon. friend must have profited by the discussion this afternoon.

Section stands.

Progress reported.

At six o'clock the House took recess.

After Recess.

The House resumed at eight o'clock.

PRIVATE BILLS.

IMPERIAL ORDER DAUGHTERS OF THE EMPIRE AND THE CHILDREN OF THE EMPIRE (JUNIOR BRANCH).

The House resumed consideration of the message from the Senate disagreeing to the second amendment made by the House of Commons to Bill No. 95, to incorporate the Imperial Order Daughters of the Empire and the Children of the Empire (Junior Branch).—Mr. Steele.

Mr. STEELE: Perhaps a word of explanation regarding this Bill may be in order at the present time and necessary for a proper understanding of the situation. When this Bill first came before the Private Bills Committee we inserted in it an amendment such as we have, during the last two years, been putting into all similar Bills, an amendment calling for the taking over of all the property, assets, etc., of the former association or society before the new incorporation, which will supplant the old one, shall be allowed to do business. When the Bill went back to the Senate with that amendment and another included, the Senate refused to concur in the amendment. When the Bill came back to the House, the House referred it again to the Private Bills Committee. We deemed it of so much importance that we thought well to endeavour if possible to satisfy the Senate that this amendment was essential. I may point out that a similar clause is inserted in all charters issued under the Company's Act. After some consideration we adopted an amendment of the amendment which we believe and know is satisfactory to the promoters of the Bill and also to the Senate. I therefore move:

That this House doth insist on its second amendment to the Bill No. 95 (Letter C-2 of the Senate), intituled: "An Act to incorporate the Imperial Order Daughters of the Empire and the Children of the Empire (Junior Branch)," for the reason: "That it is essential to provide that the provincial society, as such, shall cease to carry on its affairs when and so soon as this Bill becomes effective"; and doth amend the said amendment by inserting after the words "society," where it occurs the first time, the words "but nothing herein shall be deemed in any way to affect the rights in respect of any property, real or personal, of which any primary, municipal or provincial chapter may be possessed at the date of this Act," for the reason: "That it is desirable to avoid the possibility of any rights, as to property held by, or in trust for any of the subsidiary chapters being affected."

And that a message be sent to the Senate to acquaint their honours therewith.

Mr. McCRANEY: Is the whole of the section which has been rejected by the Senate incorporated in the motion just moved?

Mr. STEELE: Yes, the whole amendment as we originally put it in the Bill is still in the Bill, but we amended it to clear up an objection of some of the members of the Daughters of the Empire representing local chapters. They thought the or-

iginal amendment would permit the chief organization to interfere with property held by the local Chapters in trust.

Mr. McCRANEY: Then the additional amendment contained in my hon. friend's motion in addition to the section which was rejected by the Senate?

Mr. STEELE: Yes.

Mr. McCRANEY: Would my hon. friend be so good as to read the section rejected by the Senate as he now proposes amending it, because members have not before them the Bill as printed by the Commons.

Mr. STEELE: The section inserted in the Bill by the Private Bills Committee, to accomplish the purpose they had in view, was as follows:

> The Order shall acquire and take over all the existing assets, interests, rights, credits, effects and property, movable or immovable, held and enjoyed by the provincial society, and shall be subject to all the obligations and liabilities of the said provincial society, and except in so far as it may be necessary for the purposes of such transfer, the powers and authority vested in the Order under the provisions of this Act shall not be exercised or become effective until all the assets, interests, rights, credits, effects, property, obligations and liabilities of the said provincial society have been transferred to and assumed by the Order, and evidence of such transfer and assumption satisfactory to the Secretary of State of Canada has been filed with the said Secretary of State, and a statement to that effect has been published in the Canada Gazette by the said Secretary of State.

With the proposed amendment this section will read:

> The Order shall acquire and take over all the existing assets, interests, rights, credits, effects and property, movable and immovable, held and enjoyed by the provincial society, but nothing herein shall be deemed in any way to affect the rights in respect of any property real or personal, of which any primary, municipal or provincial chapter may be possessed at the date of this Act, and shall be subject to all the obligations and liabilities of the said provincial society,—

And so forth.

Mr. McCRANEY: Does that apply to provincial societies other than the one incorporated in the province of Ontario under the Revised Statutes?

Mr. STEELE: That will apply to all societies and all chapters. As a matter of fact, we believe the society incorporated under this Bill would have no right whatever to interfere with any of the properties held by the local chapters, but in order to satisfy some of the local chapters who object to this Bill, and to satisfy the Senate, we are willing to insert those words to make it perfectly clear that there would be no interference.

Mr. KNOWLES: Inasmuch as this is a new matter—I speak subject to correction—should it not go through the committee? As I understand the matter, in the Private Bills Committee, there was added to the Bill new matter which was not in the Bill as it received its second reading in this House. I do not know the exact wording of the rule, but one would think the principle of the rule would require that the additional matter inserted in the Bill by the Private Bills Committee should run the gauntlet of discussion in committee of the whole House.

I would therefore ask you if it should not first pass through committee so we may have an opportunity of exchanging views upon it in a more informal way than could be done in a Committee of the Whole. Of course, I want it to be understood that I am not in any way endeavouring to obstruct the Bill.

Mr. SPEAKER: It is quite proper for the House to order this amendment to be considered in Committee of the Whole, but it is not essential. Is it the pleasure of the House to adopt the motion?

Motion agreed to.

GORDON DIVORCE BILL.

Mr. J. W. EDWARDS (Frontenac) moved that the House go into Committee on Bill No. 126, for the relief of Albert Edwin Gordon.

Mr. M. STEELE (South Perth): Before you leave the Chair, Mr. Speaker, I would like to draw the attention of the House to a matter in connection with this Bill which I think worthy of consideration. Since the Private Bills Committee considered this Bill, information has come to me regarding an irregularity in the procedure before the Divorce Committee. I had not this information when the committee met, or I would have drawn it to their attention, and I think it probable the committee would not have taken the Bill into consideration with that information before them. I desire to make a motion, but before doing so I wish to give my reasons. I think it is an established rule, supported by the authorities, that a Committee of the House cannot accept evidence taken by a committee at a former session, without that evidence being referred to the committee by the House. Bourinot makes this quite plain, I think. At page 474 he says:

—Neither can a committee report the evidence taken before a similar committee in a previous session except as a paper in the appendix, unless it receives authority from the House to consider it.

May also gives a very clear statement on the matter. In the footnote to page 418 he says:

When for any reason the evidence taken before committee has not been laid before the House, the committee re-appointed in a subsequent session cannot report it except as a paper in the appendix.

My information is, and I believe it to be quite accurate, that the Divorce Committee did not have the evidence taken in this case in 1915 referred to this year by the Senate. In support of my belief that this was not done, I may state that a search has been made of the Minutes of Proceedings of the Senate, and it fails to reveal any reference to the evidence.

Mr. SPEAKER: Do I understand the hon. member desires to rise to a point of order?

Mr. STEELE: No, I did not rise to a point of order. I wished to draw attention to an irregularity in the procedure, and to conclude by moving that the Bill be referred back to the Private Bills Committee for further consideration.

Mr. SPEAKER: There is a question as to whether it is competent for this House to go into the matter of procedure in another Chamber. I do not wish to make a ruling upon the point, but I shall follow the hon. gentleman carefully.

Mr. STEELE: I have no desire to depart from the rules of the House. I was merely bringing the matter to the attention of the House in order to substantiate the motion I proposed moving, and was giving the reasons why I moved it. Perhaps it would be sufficient for me to conclude by moving:

That the order for the House in Committee of the Whole on Bill No. 126, (Letter T2 of the Senate) intituled "An Act for the relief of Albert Edwin Gordon" be discharged and that the Bill be referred back to the Committee on Miscellaneous Private Bills for further consideration.

Mr. SPEAKER: Is it the pleasure of the House to adopt the motion?

Mr. W. B. NORTHRUP (East Hastings): If I understood the argument of the hon. member, it was that the evidence taken in a prior year, 1915 I think, had not been laid before the Committee of the Senate. I presume this House, as the highest judicial body in the land, wishes to do what is right between the parties. I have under my hand a copy of the evidence and proceedings in this case before the Senate, and I find it was expressly agreed between the parties, in the presence of the committee, that the evidence theretofore taken should be used with permission to either party to add anything thereto the party wished. It seems to me when the hon. gentleman rises to the point he does, he must be ignorant of the fact that there was a straight agreement made between the parties and the Senate. It is found on the first page of the Minutes of Evidence, and is as follows:

Hon. Sir James Lougheed: May we expect new evidence, or are we to be confined to the evidence produced on the hearing some two sessions ago?

Mr. Wilkie: There will be some evidence.

Hon. Sir James Lougheed: I think counsel might discuss this question between themselves, and perhaps they could agree to accept the evidence which has already been taken and printed.

(Counsel confer together.)

Mr. Wilkie: My learned friend and I have agreed, subject to the wishes of the committee, that the evidence taken on the former occasion and printed shall stand, with leave to either party to supplement or explain it.

Hon. Sir James Lougheed: Is there anything that you wish to add to Mr. Gordon's evidence? I think it would be well to indicate as you proceed what the new evidence is.

Mr. Wilkie: I desire that the evidence of Mr. Gordon should stand unchanged.

The chairman: What do you say, Mr. Mikel?

Mr. Mikel: I have a copy of the evidence. I may say that I am not as familiar with it as my learned friend whom I am representing.

Then witness after witness was named, and the parties agreed that his evidence should go in. It all follows out the agreement made at the beginning:

Mr. Wilkie: My learned friend and I have agreed, subject to the wishes of the Committee, that the evidence taken on the former occasion and printed shall stand, with leave to either party to supplement or explain it.

I submit, it is one of the rules of this House that when a matter is referred to a committee prima facie the finding of that committee governs the House. I do not say it is absolutely conclusive, but prima facie it governs. In this case, we find that a Committee of the Senate after hearing the evidence came to a certain decision, and a Committee of our House agreed with the Senate. This body to-night, composed of members who have not seen the evidence, is asked practically to override the opinions expressed by those two committees. I submit that it is our duty to sit here as judges in a matter of this kind, and whatever feelings of sympathy may exist towards the respondent, the petitioner has his rights, and if the evidence he has brought

forward satisfied the Senate and the Private Bills Committee of this House, and if that evidence was put in by express agreement, the House can well proceed to give a third reading to the Bill.

Mr. J. A. CURRIE (North Simcoe): I rise to a point of order. If there is any merit in the objection to the third reading of the Bill, that evidence was taken before the committee without the consent of the House, that applies only to the Senate, and the point should be raised only in the Senate. The Senate having passed over that irregularity, have passed the measure over to us for our consideration and conclusion.

Obviously, we have no right to raise a question as to the irregularity of the proceedings of the Senate. For that reason I would ask you, Mr. Speaker, to give your ruling on that point of order.

Mr. SPEAKER: The point of order raised by the hon. member for North Simcoe (Mr. Currie) is, I have no doubt, well taken. It seems to me that when a measure comes to us from the other chamber, certified to by its proper officer as having been duly passed, and in regular form, we must be governed by that, and it is not for us to go back and make inquiry as to the regularity of the steps which were taken, or as to whether the proceedings were properly conducted by that body.

Mr. KNOWLES: May I speak to the point of order, before you give your decision?

Mr. SPEAKER: I have no objection to the hon. member expressing his views, although I have my mind pretty well made up.

Mr. KNOWLES: I am sure that no person would take any exception to the spirit which animates the hon. member for North Simcoe (Mr. Currie), namely, that we must show the utmost respect for the proceedings of the Senate. The Chairman of the Private Bills Committee is in his place. He believes that his motion is quite in order and quite proper, and he has supported it with certain observations in regard to what might have happened in the Senate. But the Chairman of the Private Bills Committee will excuse me, I am sure, if I speak for him to this extent when I say that there is no thought of casting any reflection on the Senate. I fancy that the Senate were desirous, just the same as we are, to do the correct thing, and we would respectfully bring that question up if it went back to the Private Bills Committee. Surely no offence could be taken by the other chamber. We try to treat one another with the utmost respect and we are all friends. I would submit that the motion is strictly in order, and that it is a perfectly proper procedure to send this Bill back to the Commons Private Bills Committee so that we may have the matter properly cleared up. From the record which is in our hands, it appears that an inaccuracy has crept in. I would refer the House to page 10 of the evidence, and it will see that the record contains 70 pages of evidence taken in 1915. That is bound up with the evidence taken this year. It is within these 70 pages that the evidence with regard to the alleged offence of adultery is contained. There was no doubt that it was by inadvertence that the evidence was admitted by the Senate. If we were to address an interrogation to the Senate or call their attention to the fact that the rule of the House seems to have been unintentionally controverted, I am sure that they would agree that such was the case and that they would take steps to see that the matter was properly rectified. If hon. gentlemen will look at page 10 of the evidence they will see that it reads:

> Evidence Taken on Petition of 1915.
> Minutes of Evidence.
> The Senate,
> Ottawa, March 15, 1915.

That evidence extends from page 10 to page 79.

I would support the motion that the report be referred back to the Private Bills Committee, because I think that if the Private Bills Committee had understood the position, the Bill would not have been reported until this matter was cleared up.

Mr. SPEAKER: The hon. member for Moosejaw (Mr. Knowles) must have misapprehended the point raised by the member for North Simcoe, which has nothing to do with the motion submitted by the hon. member for South Perth (Mr. Steele). The point of order raised by the hon. member for North Simcoe had to be with the reasons assigned by the mover of this amendment. If his point of order is based upon that ground it is well taken, inasmuch as it calls in question the action of the Upper Chamber. But that does not vitiate the motion made by the hon. member for South Perth.

Mr. GUTHRIE: What is the motion?

Mr. SPEAKER: That the Bill be referred back to the committee on Miscellaneous Private Bills for further consideration.

Mr. CURRIE: The reason given by the hon. member for South Perth (Mr. Steele) why this motion should be adopted was that the procedure with regard to this Bill was irregular and he wanted it referred back to the committee of this House. A committee of this House cannot cure that irregularity, which he said had taken place, and in consequence of which he asks that this Bill should go back to the Private Bills Committee.

Mr. KNOWLES: He said it was not a point of order.

Mr. CURRIE: He said that the proceedings were irregular and that for that reason he wanted the Bill sent back. But the reasons which he advanced, in view of what the Speaker has said cannot possibly be an argument for referring it back. I think the hon. member for South Perth would be justified in withdrawing his motion after the statements made by Mr. Speaker. Let us proceed with this Bill because we have only a few days more. There will be only one or more occasions when this Bill can be taken up by the House. Can it be said that there is no attempt to block this Bill? It is whispered all around that every attempt has been made to block it. Let us proceed to the third reading. Withdraw the motion.

Mr. SPEAKER: The motion submitted by the hon. member (Mr. Steele) must be regarded as an amendment to the motion which was put: that I do now leave the Chair. Mr. Edwards moved:

> That I do now leave the Chair for the House to go into Committee of the Whole on Bill No. 126, letter 2T of the Senate intituled "An Act for relief of Albert Edwin Gordon."

Mr. Steele moves in amendment, seconded by Mr. Bennett (Simcoe):

> That I do not now leave the Chair, but that the order of the House for the House to go into Committee on Bill No. 126, letter 2T of the Senate, intituled "An Act for the relief of Albert Edwin Gordon" be discharged, and that the Bill be referred back to the Committee on Miscellaneous Private Bills for further consideration.

Mr. W. H. BENNETT: As the seconder of the amendment that the Bill be referred back to the committee, I will not touch upon the point that has been raised by the Chairman of the Committee, but for other reasons I think that this Bill should be referred back. I have been a member of this House for a number of years, and for the first time in my life have I known an important divorce case to be brought down to the House and members absolutely forbidden to read the evidence. Why this departure from the old-established rule? My hon. friend from North Simcoe (Mr. Currie) says: "Who says you must not read the evidence?" Who will tell me where to get copies of the evidence to read it? Copies of the evidence are always printed and they are always placed in the boxes, but for some extraordinary reasons the evidence in this case has not been brought down and handed to members. It is true that I have seen in the possession of some of the elderly members of the committee copies of the evidence, but to be allowed to lay hands, much less eyes, upon these holy things is utterly impossible. I see one now lying upon a table before me—I will not point out which table—ear-marked and thumb-marked at the top of every page where there may be something or wherever there may appear to be something against this unfortunate woman. I am a member of this committee, and I have heard the case discussed ad libitum. I was told that if I would wander up to the committee I would find out what the mysterious parts of the evidence were in this case. I wandered up and heard the evidence discussed. On that committee there are sixty members apparently interested in what goes on at that committee, but on the occasion when this matter was decided there were but only seventeen members sufficiently interested in it to be present. The committee was almost evenly divided—there was only one of a majority in favour of granting the divorce. Is it not absurd to ask that a divorce be granted when only seventeen members, or a third of the committee were prepared to go and hear the matter discussed, and when, after it was discussed to a certain degree, there was only a majority of one in favour of it? I heard enough of the evidence to convince me that I should not vote to permit this suppliant for a divorce to be cut loose to marry any decent woman, as I believe his present wife to be. The man knew it would never do to give a point-blank denial to the evidence of this woman who had presented herself, and whose evidence, according to the committee and from what I heard, was of such a nature and such a class that he did not dare to contradict it.

Let us take another phase of this estimable party who is applying for a divorce. I think that of this unhappy marriage there

are two children—two or three. Will you believe that, although this is a man of very considerable means according to the evidence, so little parental love has he in his makeup or composition, so utter is his disregard for the common decencies of life, that he does not go before the courts to-day, if this woman has been guilty of adultery and he can prove it, to have it ordered that she shall be dispossessed of the custody of the children and they shall be remanded to his care. If the statements alleged by him are true, why does he not go to the courts and say: I, the father of those children, do not propose to allow this woman, who is an unworthy woman, to have charge of them; I will take them into my own charge. To make it even worse than that, after an arrangement had been made by which he was to pay her a certain amount of money for maintenance—

Mr. MORPHY: That has nothing to do with the case. The man is taking care of his own children.

Mr. W. H. BENNETT: My hon. friend came late into the case. He did not hear the evidence.

Mr. NORTHUP: I hold in my hand the judgment of the court—Sir William Mulock—between these parties.

Mr. W. H. BENNETT: An action for alimony was brought by her, as I understand, and she was adjudged a certain amount, and the complainant in this case failed to pay the amount; he has not paid her anything since November last.

Mr. NORTHUP: Not the case at all.

Mr. W. H. BENNETT: I happened to glance at one of the copies of the evidence to-night, and it is evident that they went all around the bush to beat this woman out; they even tried to make her out a thief when she was working hard at the occupation she took up as a milliner in Chicago; they tried to prove that she had been guilty of stealing. At every turn she took they had detectives on the track, or some evidence of that class to try and vilify her and beat down her reputation. We hear a great deal about detectives. We know that once you put a detective on the track to hunt down a woman, it is his business, in order to secure further occupation, to get a committal. Why, a case was reported in Toronto a few days ago; a detective was called in with some others to make an arrest, and while they were making the arrest he actually stole some $20 which he found lying around, and they had to arrest the detective. That is a fair sample of detective work, and all the evidence against this woman is, in the main, the evidence of detectives. This man comes here, not with clean hands, but with disgustingly filthy hands, the hands of a party to procuring an abortion, and he wants the House of Commons to grant him a divorce so that he may go out and marry again. I am not going to vote for any divorce of this kind, and I am willing to leave the parties where they are.

Mr. EDWARDS: I am in a rather peculiar position so far as this particular case is concerned, inasmuch as I must confess that I never heard of it until late this afternoon; in fact it was after six o'clock before I knew that such a case had been before the Senate and that my name was connected with it as sponsor for the Bill in this House. I do not know who takes it upon himself to attach the name of a member who is not even a member of the Private Bills Committee to a Bill to come before this House. I want to assure the committee that in this case it was done without my sanction and without my knowledge. As I said, I did not even know that such a case had been before the Senate until after six o'clock, when I was informed that the first hour to-night would be given up to Private Bills and that I was sponsor for one of the Bills. I understand that only a few members of the Senate committee gave attention to this Bill, only some eight or nine, and the Bill passed the Senate committee by a very small majority. We have been told that only a small proportion of the House of Commons committee gave consideration to the matter, and the time is very short for giving consideration to it now. I am disposed to favour the motion of the hon. member for South Perth (Mr. Steele), because I certainly know, from a glance at one page of the evidence, that the hon. member for Simcoe (Mr. W. H. Bennett) was absolutely wrong in regard to this woman stealing, because the evidence shows that she admited that herself. That is, however, only one point, but I think there is no doubt about that.

Mr. GRAHAM: That is not a reason for divorce.

Mr. EDWARDS: At page 156 of the evidence I find the following:

Q. When you were recently in Chicago did you take a situation?—A. Yes I did.
Q. With whom?—A. Marshall Field's.
Q. How long were you with them?—A. Well, I do not just know, I was with them several months.

Q. How did the employment terminate, or why?—A. Well, I left; I wanted to be with the children and I left.

Q. Was there any difficulty between you and Marshall Field & Co.?—A. No.

Q. Did you sign any documents before you left Marshall Field & Co.?—A. I do not know that I did.

Q. Oh, but yes, Mrs. Gordon, you would not forget that; did you sign any documents before you left Marshall Field & Co.?—A. Yes, I did.

Q. What was the purport of it?—A. If you have got the document you can look up and see.

Q. Tell me the purport of it.

Mr. Mikel: This is irrelevant.

Mr. Wilkie: It is a matter of credibility of the witness.

By Mr. Wilkie:

Q. Did that document have to do with the matter of your honesty?

Mr. Mikel: Surely we are not trying the witness' honesty.

The Chairman: Mr. Wilkie is dealing with the credibility of the witness. He may ask the question, but if she denies it that ends it.

By Mr. Wilkie:

Q. Then will you tell me, had that statement anything to do with your honesty?—A. Yes, it had.

Q. Had you been accused of stealing?—A. Yes.

Q. And did you, in writing, confess to the fact?—A. Well, of course, I would like to make an explanation in regard to that.

Q. I should like your answer first, and then your explanation may follow.—A. Yes, I will admit that.

Q. Then give me your explanation.—A. I was employed in the millinery department in Marshall Field's, and of course I handled the merchandise, and in handling the merchandise I came across different little articles which were badly damaged, and in fact they were no use at all, as far as selling them in the store was concerned. One of the articles was a flower, and I do not know what else, but at any rate I did, I must admit, I will have to admit that I took them, but the reason I took them was that they were so terribly badly damaged that they never could have been sold. Of course I should not have done that, even at that.

Q. There was a search made for the articles?—A. Yes.

Q. And where were they found?—A. After I told them, I was questioned regarding the matter, and I told the person who made the inquiries that I had—they asked me if I had them, and if I would return them—and I told them that I had them at the house, and they could have them and welcome—and I did return them.

Q. Was a search made of the house?—A. Yes.

Q. Whose house?—A. My brother's house.

Mr. CURRIE: What was the evidence as to the value?

Mr. EDWARDS: The evidence continues:

Q. That brother where your children are now?—A. Yes.

Q. In Chicago?—A. Yes.

Q. Can you give me an idea of the total value of the goods that were found there belonging to Marshall Field & Co.?—A. No, I could not.

Q. Am I wrongly instructed when I am told that they would approximate $1,000?—A. Yes, that is wrong, it would not be that much at all.

Q. Then about how much?—A. I haven't any idea.

If my hon. friend can produce any corroboration for the statement that the respondent was wrongfully accused of stealing, after what I have just read, he is a cleverer lawyer than I think he is.

Mr. STEELE: Is theft a ground for divorce?

Mr. EDWARDS: I am not saying that it is, but I am pointing to the fact that only a small number of the members of the Senate committee gave any attention to this matter, and that only a small number of the Commons committee attended the meetings of that committee. The misstatement of the hon. member for East Simcoe, as shown by the evidence, is, to my mind, strongly in favour of the motion moved by the hon. gentleman from South Perth (Mr. Steele). I do not know anything about it further than what I have read, but it appears to me to be a matter concerning the conduct of a man and a woman, and, inasmuch as these matters come before us for consideration, we should not deal with them lightly. And we should not fritter away time, when only one hour is allowed for consideration. It seems to me impossible to deal with it fairly in a few minutes' time, and, therefore, that this House would be acting properly in adopting the motion that this Bill be referred back to the committee, when we hope that a greater number of the members will attend, and that they will arrive at a proper conclusion.

Mr. GRAHAM: The severance of the marriage tie is a very serious matter. I have almost reached the conclusion that there seldom is a case so clear against one party, with no case against the other, that any divorce should be granted. Here is a case where the committees in both Houses were divided. The committee of the House of Commons certainly was divided, and the remarks we have heard to-night show the reason why. We are asked in this House to pass the third reading of a Bill which legally makes one party lily white, and relegates the other to the lower strata of society for the remainder of her life. Can we do that without having facts to substantiate our position thoroughly? To-

night is the first time I have heard this Bill discussed. We must not forget that we have in our hands the future of these two parties. I have always considered a divorce case one of the most serious matters that can be placed before a committee of this House. When these cases come to the House itself the committee is usually pretty unanimous, and we accept their finding. Only on two or three occasions has there been an exception to this in my time in this House, and I have been here several years. I make it a point to destroy all evidence in divorce cases, as soon as I see what it is, and never read it unless the case is celebrated, and there is a division of opinion in committee. In such a case I have always felt it my duty to scan the evidence to see what attitude I ought to take in the House, because then a great responsibility comes to every one of us. We are asked in this House solemnly to vote to-night to sever the marriage tie between two people who have three children, and we have not seen the evidence—

An hon. MEMBER: Two children.

Mr. GRAHAM: —much less have we had the opportunity of seeing the witnesses. The committee has accepted the evidence taken two years ago, as far as it goes, and I do not care anything about the technicalities, so far as my vote is concerned, as to whether this evidence was properly before that committee or not. This evidence has not been before this House, and I will not accept the responsibility of voting to sever the marriage tie between these two people, where such a divergence of opinion exists between the members who have read the evidence and considered the case, until I know what is in the evidence, because I feel that I have a responsibility which I cannot shirk. I am going to vote for the motion to refer this back to the committee, and when this Bill comes up again, unless the members of the House have been supplied with the evidence, I will vote against the third reading of the Bill. I will take no person's word in this case, after what I have heard. I desire to ask a question, and perhaps it may assume the proportions of a point of order: Can the Private Bills Committee ask this House to pass upon a question, when the rule which provides for giving us the evidence is violated? I do not know that I will put it as a point of order; but I believe that it is not fair to the members and the Private Bills Committee have no right, no matter what the Senate Committee did, to ask us to vote either yea or nay on this question unless we are provided with the evidence on which we can base an opinion.

Mr. WILLIAM THOBURN (North Lanark): For the information of the member for South Renfrew (Mr. Graham), I may say that the reason given by the Senate Committee for not having the evidence published—it is, perhaps, the first time in the history of that committee that the evidence in a case of this kind has not been published—was that they thought that the evidence was of such a nature that it should not be sent broadcast over this Dominion. The evidence is now being printed, and it is expected that it will be in the boxes of all members of the House to-morrow morning.

Mr. GRAHAM: After we have been asked for the third reading of the Bill.

Some hon. MEMBERS: Question.

Mr. THOBURN: Under the circumstances could not the matter stand without its being referred back to the committee?

Some hon. MEMBERS: Question.

Mr. HUGH GUTHRIE (South Wellington): I was in attendance at the Private Bills Committee when this Bill first came before it, and I was one of those who took objection to the committee's proceeding further with the consideration of the matter, on the ground that no copy of the evidence had been furnished to any member of the committee at that time. A stenographic copy of the evidence lay on the chairman's table, and we were told that we might have the privilege of perusing it if we saw fit. I was supported in my objection by a number of members of the committee, and it was ordered that the Senate be requested to print and distribute the evidence in the usual way. I received a copy of the evidence in due course, and I was under the impression until this evening that every member of the House had received a copy of the evidence in accordance with the rule. I stated in the committee that I did not think any one could intelligently pass upon the question who had not access to the evidence. I am rather surprised to-night to find that members have not been so supplied. When I received the evidence I read it carefully and I founded my conclusions upon it. I voted in the committee in favour of the granting of this divorce, but I should not have voted at all had I not had access to the evidence. I think that the member for South Renfrew (Mr. Graham) has put the case fairly; before the Bill proceeds,

the evidence should be received by the members. I understand that the evidence is being printed and will be distributed to-morrow. I do not see that any object will be accomplished by referring the matter back to the committee. Only 17 members of the committee met on the last occasion, but the matter was dealt with exhaustively, as is the case with all such Bills, and the committee reported the Bill to this House. Although the committee consists of about 30 or 35 members, we must remember that this House consists of 220 members. If we get the evidence to-morrow and the Bill is taken up in its regular course on Monday, I think all objections should be satisfied. I know that there is an evident intention on the part of some people, with the end of the session coming nearer, to delay the Bill. It is commonly whispered throughout the corridors—

Mr. KNOWLES: Will the hon. gentleman name any person who pretends to do that?

Mr. GUTHRIE: I do not propose to name anybody.

Mr. KNOWLES: You had better not assert it, then.

Mr. GUTHRIE: I can say what I believe, notwithstanding the contradiction—

Mr. KNOWLES: My hon. friend's remark includes all members.

Mr. GUTHRIE: I did not say members; I said throughout the corridors.

Mr. KNOWLES: It could be done only by members.

Mr. SPEAKER: Order.

Mr. GUTHRIE: I think that justice will be done and that the House will
9 p.m. be fully informed in the usual way if the matter stands until Monday, when the evidence will be in the hands of all the members.

Mr. SPEAKER: The hour for Private Bills is exhausted.

LIVE STOCK EXCHANGE.

The House on Committee on Bill No. 123, respecting live stock.—Mr. M. Burrell—Mr. Rainville in the Chair.

On section 1—Short title.

Mr. OLIVER: Has the minister given a explanation of this Bill to the House?

Mr. BURRELL: Yes, I gave a full explanation on the introduction of the Bill. After it was read the second time it was referred to the Agricultural Committee, who had the Bill before them twice and discussed it pretty thoroughly. Such amendments as were made—they are all of a minor character—were unanimously adopted by the committee. There is an amendment to section 1. The old title was " The Live Stock and Produce Act." It was thought that the word "Produce" was rather confusing, so the title was changed to " The Live Stock and Live Stock Products Act."

Amendment agreed to, and section as amended agreed to.

On section 2—Definitions.

Mr. NESBITT: Did not the minister insert some amendments in the Bill? If so, will he tell me what they are?

Mr. BURRELL: I have just explained that there were several amendments passed at a meeting of the committee. The first is in section 1, which has just been passed. The amendment is that the title, instead of being "The Live Stock and Produce Act," should be "The Live Stock and Live Stock Products Act." The next amendment is the addition of the following as paragraph (g) at the end of section 2:

> Live stock products means meat, poultry, eggs and wool.

That corresponds with section 9. The next amendment is by adding this subsection to section 3:

> Nothing in this Act or in any regulation made hereunder shall take away or in any manner limit the right of any farmer or drover to sell his live stock at any stock yard.

Mr. MORPHY: Should not the words "or other person" be inserted after the word "drover?"

Mr. BURRELL: It is assumed that such sellers would be farmers or drovers.

Mr. MORPHY: That is not a fair assumption. Many people who are neither farmers nor drovers have stock to sell.

Mr. BURRELL: I suppose a section could be inserted covering that. This was designed simply to differentiate the farmer or drover from the man who was selling on commission. There was some discussion on this amendment, but I do not know whether that point was raised or not. In section 7, after the words "and a schedule of the fees," the words "and charges" are added. In section 9, paragraph (a) the words "and operated" are added, so that the paragraph reads.

The manner in which stock yards are to be constructed, maintained, equipped and operated.

Those are the only amendments.

Section 2, as amended, agreed to.

On section 3—Live stock exchange at stock yards:

Mr. PUGSLEY: Will the minister explain the practical application of this phrase:

Unless he holds a special license from the minister.

Mr. BURRELL: That is explained in some of the sections following. If there was any dispute in any stock yard between the department and the stockyard, and it was clearly shown that an injustice was being done to the stock owner or farmer sending his stock there, and there was liable to be an interruption of business, we would have the right to issue a special license in order that the business should not be interrupted in the stock yard. Such a case is not likely to turn up, but this is provided in order that the selling may go on.

Mr. NESBITT: If there was trouble in the exchange, a special license would authorize the commission merchant to go on doing business?

Mr. BURRELL: Yes.

Mr. PUGSLEY: Is it the intention that every stock yard as defined in paragraph f of section 2—

"Stock yard" means any area of land used as a public market for purchasing and selling live stock, with the buildings, fences, gates, chutes, weigh scales and other equipment situated thereon and used in connection therewith.

—can be required by the minister to have a stock exchange established in connection with it?

Mr. BURRELL: Yes. The term "stock yard" is used. There are only six stock yards in the whole of Canada.

Mr. PUGSLEY: I happen to know a place in New Brunswick in which there is an area of land where cattle are sold, so that it would come within the definition in paragraph f. It would strike the people who deal at that market as a most undesirable thing that they should be compelled to have a stock exchange in connection with it. No large operations are carried on there, but still it is a place where cattle are regularly sold, and this regulation would therefore cover it. That is not the intention?

[Mr. Burrell.]

Mr. BURRELL: No.

Mr. PUGSLEY: Then why use language which would so clearly express that?

Mr. BURRELL: I do not think it could be interpreted in that way although I quite admit that it might be, as my hon. friend states, in some people's minds. But there are in Canada only six stockyards as they are ordinarily understood in the trade.

Mr. PUGSLEY: What constitutes a stock yard?

Mr. BURRELL: That matter was gone over very carefully not with our department, but with the parliamentary counsel, and this is his wording of the whole section. A stock yard is a yard in which live stock is sold by commission men, bought by packers and butchers, and is a great centre of live stock business. There is one at Calgary, one at Edmonton, one at Winnipeg, one at Toronto and two at Montreal. They comprise the whole of the stock yards in Canada as stock yards are known amongst the live stock men of the country. There may be here and there some small places such as that to which the hon. member refers, but I do not think they would come under the ordinary term "stock yards" as used in the trade, and apparently this was satisfactory to the parliamentary committee and to the counsel. There was not the slightest intention of applying it to any place except to those recognized stock yards that I have named.

Mr. PUGSLEY: Then some language should be used which would make that clear. What is ordinarily known as a stock yard might be a very different thing from a stock yard after Parliament has given a legislative definition. The definition is not limited to these big stock yards in the cities, but it would take in every little place where ordinarily, once a week we shall say, cattle are brought in and bought and sold.

Mr. NESBITT: Are they not sold by auction at the stock yards mentioned?

Mr. PUGSLEY: Not necessarily by auction; some are private sales, and some are by auction. It is a place to which people bring their cattle on regular days, for the purpose of making sales, other people attending there to buy.

Mr. BURRELL:. Is that not more in the nature of what is known as a market? It is not called a stock yard in the ordinary sense of the word.

Mr. PUGSLEY: But the minister is asking Parliament to give a definition to it. It

will then become a stock yard within the meaning of this statute. That is not what the minister intends, and why can he not use language which would declare what he intends?

Mr. BURRELL: Although I may admit there is some force in what my hon. friend says, if we were to apply regulations in the strict legal definition, I can only repeat that every man in the country who deals in live stock at all, the farmers, drovers, butchers, abattoir men, and so on, mean only the great stock yards of the country by the term "stock yard." Apart from that, there would be absolutely no intention to apply this to any of the smaller organizations to which my hon. friend refers, which are not really stock yards at all. There would be no intention of applying it except to stock yards which are known as such. The place my hon. friend refers to is not ordinarily known as a stock yard.

Mr. PUGSLEY: But the moment this Act passes it will become a stock yard.

Mr. GRAHAM: The minister has mentioned the places where these stock yards exist. Could he not name them in the Bill?

Mr. BURRELL: One difficulty in the way would be that there might be stock yards of this kind established in some of the larger centres. It is not so long ago since the Edmonton stock yards were established —about a year ago, I think. Everybody knows what it means, and that is a stock yard to which stock is shipped in large numbers, and where there are commission merchants. If we name them we would perhaps shut out the creation of another stock yard in a very big centre. In spite of what my hon. friend says, there would be no likelihood, and certainly no intention, of it being interpreted as being applied in any shape or form except to those places which are recognized in the trade as stock yards.

Mr. NESBITT: Clause (f) says that a stockyard means any area of land used as a public market for purchasing and selling live-stock. Some hon. gentlemen seem to think that might include places where men are buying and selling privately, for instance, at our country fairs. Of course, you do not intend to include such places as those?

Mr. BURRELL: No.

Mr. NESBITT: Then why not say "stockyard means any area of land used as a public market for purchasing and selling live-stock on commission?"

Mr. BURRELL: That definition would not cover the case of a farmer selling his own stock, for a private owner may sell his own stock in a stockyard. I think it would be extremely difficult to get a definition that would entirely meet the point raised by the hon. member from St. John. At the same time, I do not think there would be the slightest difficulty in working it out as it is, because the term is known so well in the trade that there is not the slightest likelihood of confusion.

Mr. MORPHY: If there was no definition of "stockyard" at all, it seems to me it would be a good deal plainer. It is rather confusing as it is. The minister says a stock yard, under this Bill is a place where stock is sold on commission, but he does not say that in the definition of a stock yard. When you look at sections 3 and 4 confusion seems to arise in regard to the establishment of a stock exchange in a stock yard. The stock exchange idea seems to clear it up, if hon. members will look at it carefully:

3. There shall be a live stock exchange in connection with each stock yard operated under this Act, of which live stock exchange every commission merchant doing business at such stock yard shall be a member, unless he holds a special license from the minister.

4. A live stock exchange shall not be operated until the by-laws to regulate the management and business of such exchange have been duly approved by the minister, and a written notification of such approval has been sent by the minister to the secretary of such live stock exchange.

A public market which might be considered to be a stock yard would not be a "stock yard" under this Act, unless by-laws, etc., were prepared and sanctioned by the minister, and a stock exchange established which would be regulated by these rules, regulations and by-laws.

Mr. PUGSLEY: If my hon. friend will look at section 8, he will see that the minister is obliged within a delay of not more than three months, to cause a stock exchange to be established in connection with each stockyard. The minister's difficulty is, I think, that he is under the impression that although Parliament may give a definition to the term "stock yard" it would not mean anything more than it means now. That is not the case. The moment Parliament declares that any area of land used as a public market for purchasing and selling live stock shall be deemed a stock yard within the meaning of this Act, the difficulty will arise, and it will be the duty of the minister to order a stock exchange, even in connection with those smaller markets.

Would the minister not agree to put it in this way?—

Stock yard means any area of land used as a public market for purchasing and selling live stock, and designated by the minister as being a stock yard, which should be brought under the provisions of this Act?

It seems to me that would make it clear.

Mr BURRELL: I would have no objection to that. Of course, there is a little confusion in this way; there are two elements in the stock yard business. We are dealing in one case with the live stock exchange, so far as it affects the buying and selling operations. The rest of the Bill, so far as it affects stock yards, deals with the ownership and management of the stock yards, apart from the buying and selling. If the amendment suggested by my hon. friend makes it any clearer, I have no objection to adopting it.

Mr. PUGSLEY: I will draft something and send it to the minister.

Mr. OLIVER: I agree with what has been said by my hon. friend from North Perth (Mr. Morphy). The essential thing is the establishment of an exchange. It is the establishment of the exchange that brings the stock yard under the regulations of the Act. Therefore I do not see any purpose in having a separate definition of what constitutes a stock yard. Wherever a stock exchange has been authorized by the minister, it is a stock yard. That absolutely settles the point, and the confusion that arises by reason of the definition would disappear if the definition were simply stricken out.

Mr. BURRELL: All those points were placed before the Parliamentary Counsel. Of course, I do not pretend to say what should or should not be included in the Bill in the way of definitions. There is, however this feature which must be borne in mind, that a stock yard is a dual business, the live stock exchange being one phase of it, and the stock yard management being another. There may be things about the stock yards, in regard to the buying and selling which it might be desirable to touch in connection with this Bill. I do not see any objection to including a definition of the stock yard, and it seems to me that the addition of something such as suggested by my hon. friend from St. John would absolutely clear it up. If we say that it is such a place as is designated by the minister, I think that would cover all the points.

[Mr. Pugsley.]

Mr. OLIVER: What authority goes with the live stock exchange, and how it is constituted?

Mr. R. B. BENNETT: What are the conditions precedent to its establishment?

Mr. OLIVER: Yes.

Mr. BURRELL: Some stock yards operate, as far as the buying and selling operations go, under live stock exchanges. I think that Toronto does so, and I fancy Montreal also. Two or three of them operate through the live stock exchange in so far as the buying, selling and handling by the commission men go. The live stock exchange operates in an analogous way to the Grain Exchange of Winnipeg. It conducts the actual buying and selling operations, but it does not have to do anything with the management of the stock yards.

Mr. PUGSLEY: Would the minister allow me to suggest an amendment? I think it might be well to amend paragraph (f) by inserting after the word "market" the words "designated by the minister as suitable to be brought under the provisions of this Act."

Mr. R. B. BENNETT: Is not that a little dangerous? What the hon. member for Edmonton (Mr. Oliver) has spoken of is the only important matter as far as we are concerned. The stock dealers in the West are very apprehensive of the word "exchange," and that is the reason, I take it, why my hon. friend from Edmonton (Mr. Oliver) was laying such stress upon the conditions precedent to the establishment of the exchange. I think he is absolutely right in that. The explanation of the minister is that it is an innocuous and harmless thing, but, unfortunately, the word "exchange" has a meaning to the ordinary man, producing from four to seven head of cattle, which is not innocuous and not harmless. It is to meet any possible difficulty that might occur that, I take it, my hon. friend from Edmonton is interposing his observations. We have in Calgary a stock exchange the majority of the shares of which are held by the Canadian Pacific Railway Company. There is one in Winnipeg where the railways and the city have united in a scheme that enables it to be operated with some degree of fairness. For the reasons that the public have so strongly criticised the grain exchanges, there is always the danger that the same conditions will arise in the cattle exchanges. If the minister makes it clear that the Government can exercise sufficient control, if necessary, as

to the conditions under which such institutions shall be operated, and that there shall be some form of a control in the shape of a license, perhaps the people will have more confidence in it.

Mr. BURRELL: That is provided for in the Bill.

Mr. R. B. BENNETT: I have not read the section, but, that being so, it would meet very considerable difficulties which my hon. friend has referred to. We cannot get away from the fact that there is a measure of suspicion and doubt among people who have a small number of cattle with regard to anything called an exchange, because it will not be possible to disassociate the cattle exchange from the grain exchange in the public mind. People will not be quite sure. I do not quite see that the amendment of my hon. friend from St. John (Mr. Pugsley) would advance it very much. He says that you should leave open to the minister the power to say that this is a stock exchange.

Mr. MORPHY: No, stock yard.

Mr. R. B. BENNETT: I do not think that the Act was intended to operate in that way. I understood that, provided a stock yard complied with certain conditions, the minister would say in his certificate that the conditions met the demand. If those conditions were complied with the certificate should be given as a matter of course. This is a legal matter. Perhaps my hon. and learned friend (Mr. Pugsley) will remember that Mr. Fulton, when he was provincial secretary of British Columbia, let some papers lie in his office for an undue time and failed to give a certificate at the time he should have given it. They brought action against him, and the Privy Council held that the action would properly lie against him, although he was a public officer, because the law imposed upon him the duty of sending out these papers within a certain time. I take it that the draftsmen of this Bill proceeded upon that principle. With respect to the amendment, I think it should not prevail, because the minister should not have imposed upon him the duty of saying if the certificate should issue. The Act should determine what a stock yard is, and then his certificate could issue when the conditions provided for exist.

Mr. PUGSLEY: The object I had in view in suggesting the amendment was to prevent small stock yards throughout the country from coming within the provisions of this Act. At St. John there is a place where cattle, sheep and hogs are regularly brought and offered for sale. Under this definition of a stock yard such places would be included.

Mr. R. B. BENNETT: I see the point.

Mr. PUGSLEY: That is the point I want to cover and if the language I propose is not sufficient for that purpose it ought to be possible to use some language that would cover it.

Mr. R. B. BENNETT: If my hon. friend cannot use language that is sufficient to effect that purpose it cannot be used in this House.

Mr. PUGSLEY: I am not proud of it.

Mr. R. B. BENNETT: We do not want this Bill to apply to the hundred and one little stock yards that exist all over the country.

Mr. PUGSLEY: Does not my hon. friend think that under the language of paragraph (f) it would apply?

Mr. R. B. BENNETT: If you really think the danger is a real one we should remedy it, because there are little institutions all over the country where live stock is bought and sold. In Edmonton there are three or four, and in Calgary there are three or four besides the big stock yards. That, I apprehend, is what we want to prevent. You would not want it to apply to the smaller institutions?

Mr. OLIVER: No.

Mr. MORPHY: I have a suggestion that I think will meet the idea pretty well. I would say:

"Stock yard" means any area of land used as a public market and operated under the provisions of this Act for purchasing and selling live stock.

Mr. R. B. BENNETT: That covers it I think.

Mr. PUGSLEY: Yes, that would be quite satisfactory to me.

Mr. ROBB: I was not present at the Committee on Agriculture when this Bill was discussed, and I am not positive that I know what the purpose of the minister is in introducing it. Does he hope that this will assist stock raisers to get larger prices for their products? It looks as if it might permit a group of men to get together and fix prices, crowding out the average buyer who has been doing business for many years fairly well and who, by competition,

gives the stock raiser all that the market will stand.

Mr. BURRELL: I explained the purpose of the Bill when I introduced it, and it was also discussed fully in the Agricultural Committee. The purpose is precisely the opposite of what my hon. friend seems to fear. The department have been looking into the stock yards feature for two years, and this Bill is the result of a widespread and insistent demand of the stock raisers, owing to abuses in stock yards which they wish to have remedied by governmental regulation. They have felt that commission men occasionally were not to be relied upon, that their charges were too high, that they acted in collusion, and that, in the management of the stockyards, there was sometimes discrimination in such things as the allocation of space. There were also long-standing grievances in regard to the charging of exorbitant prices for feed for stock and the furnishing of poor feed and complaints respecting weighing etc. There was a great deal of dissatisfaction, especially in the West. The purpose of the Bill is two-fold, to exercise control over the owners and managers of stock yards, and to make all commission men belong to a live stock exchange whose constitution and by-laws shall be submitted to the approval of the minister, in order that control may be exercised over the operations of the exchange. There is, however, nothing to prevent a private owner going to any stockyard and selling his own cattle. Our whole object is to improve the conditions as they affect the raiser of live stock, by giving him a fairer deal in his market than in the past. Some of the strongest demands have come from the Western Live Stock Union, and we have had telegrams saying they are heartily in sympathy with the Bill. After the first meeting of the Agricultural Committee, a personal letter, with the Bill, was sent to every live stock yard management and to every live stock association, and suggestions were invited. We have received no adverse comment, but we have had approval of the object of the Bill.

Mr. OLIVER: Following what the hon. member for Calgary (Mr. R. B. Bennett) has said, the term "exchange" has a sinister sound to our people in the West. We have had very serious experiences which we believe have grown out of the power and the authority of the Winnipeg Grain Exchange. It is many years since the grain producers of the West became convinced that the Winnipeg Grain Exchange was, in its operations, a detriment to the welfare of the people of that country. The Government has practically eliminated the Winnipeg Grain Exchange, and to-day it is out of business—and I think there are no mourners except those who were members of it. That being the experience of the West in regard to the Grain Exchange, the minister will have to pardon us if we are somewhat timorous about the establishment of a live-stock exchange. We have at Edmonton a stock yard which was started last fall by a number of enterprising local men and is operated simply as a stock yard proposition—that is, the owners are not dealers in live-stock. That has been of great benefit to the stock producers of that part of the country.

Mr. WILLIAM SMITH: Has that stock yard been a financial success?

Mr. OLIVER: I do not know whether it has been beneficial to the investors, but it has been of great advantage to the producers of live-stock throughout the country, a vast benefit to the live-stock producers of Northern Alberta in ways not thought of when the stock yards were established.

It has been, for instance, a means of exchange between the parts of the country that were perhaps short of feed and the parts of the country that had abundance of feed. A great deal of trade was done last fall in cattle through the stock yards in that line, which was of vast benefit to the stock interests of the country. Buyers have come from Toronto to buy at those stock yards. So far as the business end of the stock yards is concerned, they have been of very great benefit to the stock industry, and, as far as we can see, will continue to be a benefit. There has been, I take it, no stock exchange there, up to the present time. For my part, I would be very desirous of seeing the present conditions continue. I do not want to see any legalized combination amongst the men who are buying on commission at that stock yard.

Mr. MORPHY: Is there no association?

Mr. OLIVER: No, not so far as I am aware at present. The men are there acting individually. The United Farmers of Alberta has one commission buyer there. I forget the name of the other association, but there are two that I know of, and I believe several others.

Mr. MORPHY: Are there no regulations or rules?

Mr. OLIVER: I could not say anything about that. There may be regulations or

rules of the stock yard company. Everything is now operated under the control and rule of the stock yard company, and, so far, it is entirely satisfactory as far as I know. What I want to see—and what I am satisfied the people of the West want to see—is that the supervision of the stock yards and of the business of the stock yards shall be carried out by the Government, and that no part of that responsibility shall be delegated to an association of the commission buyers who are operating on that market. As a western man, I take alarm at that feature of the proposal. It is necessary for the proper working of the Bill, which I certainly consider very desirable, that there should be government supervision over and above the supervision of the owners of the stock yard—a dominant supervision to see that conditions are as they ought to be, and to see that those who desire to use the stock yards get an even deal, and to ensure that those who purport to buy and sell on commission shall be responsible men, duly licensed and under penalty if they fail in their obligations. That all, as I maintain, should be carried out under supervision, according to the terms of this Bill or some similar Bill. With regard to the provision that sets up those parties who are buying on commission as a separate authority, giving them control which should not be exercised except by the Government, I shall certainly have to hear from the minister very much more complete and satisfactory explanation than he has yet given us. I am entirely in sympathy with the purpose of the Bill, so far as it relates to government supervision of the yards and of the trade, and of those who are carrying on the trade, but I am absolutely against any delegation of authority to an association of men who are carrying on the trade.

Mr. J. E. ARMSTRONG: Would the hon. gentleman show us the section he is referring to when he says that the minister delegates certain powers to others?

Mr. OLIVER: If I understand correctly sections 3 and 4 provide for the constitution of a live stock exchange under authority from the minister, to provide its own by-laws and regulations. That is the provision to which I object.

Mr. R. B. BENNETT: What the hon. member for Edmonton has stated with respect to the matter generally is unquestionably correct, so far as the West is concerned. There is no argument about it, they simply feel there is a measure of suspicion attaching to any body of men who do business under the name of exchange. That is the story in a nutshell. Litigation took place in Manitoba in connection with the Winnipeg Grain Exchange under the Criminal Code, which resulted in the acquittal of one of the members, and subsequently resulted in legislation which changed the whole character of the operations of that exchange. That litigation has had such an effect on the public mind that the United Farmers and the Grain Growers have been endeavouring to establish exchanges for all kinds of agricultural products and commodities of their own. It is the word "exchange" that causes the trouble in this Bill.

Mr. OLIVER: Not that word only.

Mr. R. B. BENNETT: I think my hon. friend attaches perhaps a great deal of importance to the word "exchange" but on looking at the Bill carefully, he will find that the difficulties which arose in Manitoba, and which were the subject matter of litigations, have been provided for here by vesting a general authority in the minister, which did not exist in Manitoba. It was felt that they had there an Act of incorporation and a constitution that put them, as my hon. friend said, entirely beyond the law, and they arrogated to themselves the right to do what they pleased, when they pleased, and how they pleased, and do every other sort of business just as they pleased, which was detrimental to the interests of the community. The live stock exchanges, as I understand it, if we can eliminate our pre-conceived notions, are much sought after by the farmer, as well as by the dealer, using the very word "exchange" as indicating a body of certificated or licensed commission men, who will be able to maintain a certain general reputation for the institution and to see that the business is conducted in a decent and a proper manner. If that idea were lived up to instead of the idea that attaches by reason of the dealings in Manitoba in relation to other things we should not have so much trouble. The hon. member for Edmonton properly remarked that on account of the free entry of cattle into the United States considerable number of buyers from that country have come to Edmonton, Calgary and other points and I believe there has been a very general disposition on the part of all those interested in the live stock industry in those provinces to build these live stock yards, and the corollary of that, so they tell me, is some sort of exchange—not the sort

of exchange that my hon. friend has referred to which is obnoxious to everybody, but a body that might be able to deal with the situation and yet be under such control as to prevent the possibility of injury being done to the farmer. That is the story, and I think, if my hon. friend will look at the section he will see that the Government must assume the whole responsibility for it. I think this provision will probably meet the difficulty that I have always felt in connection with these exchanges, and which my hon. friend has just referred to. Section 3 reads:

3. There shall be a live stock exchange in connection with each stock yard operated under this Act, of which live stock exchange every commission merchant doing business at such stock yard shall be a member, unless he holds a special license from the minister.

I am not sure that the provision "unless he holds a special license from the minister" is useful. Section 4 says:

(1) A live stock exchange shall not be operated until the by-laws to regulate the management and business of such exchange have been duly approved by the minister, and a written notification of such approval has been sent by the minister to the secretary of such live stock exchange.

I am not so sure that that language is calculated to overcome the difficulty to which the member for Edmonton referred. Probably it would be better to have some other tribunal than the men themselves to decide upon their own integrity. It was in connection with that very point that the difficulty in Winnipeg arose. The section continues:

(2) Such by-laws shall provide for the admission as members of such live stock exchange of such persons as desire to carry on the business of commission merchants, and who furnish evidence of integrity and financial standing satisfactory to the executive of the exchange, and such by-laws shall require every commission merchant becoming a member of the exchange to furnish sufficient and satisfactory security for the proper accounting by such commission merchant of the proceeds of any sales received by him, and of any money paid to him to effect any purchase.

That is nothing more than the provisions that obtain in the Grain Act with respect to elevator licenses. As to the general principle of the establishment of an exchange, I am advised by the men who frequent these exchanges, not as buyers, but as sellers, that it conduces to the proper carrying on of the business to have a secretary there to whom a man with a dozen cattle may go and say: I have a dozen cattle; who is buying to-day? The secretary may say: Smith is buying, from Chicago; Burns, from Calgary; Gallagher, from Edmonton. The all-important point to which the member for Edmonton referred as to the conditions precedent to the establishment of the exchange is one to which this committee should give serious consideration. After the exchange is established the regulations will be sufficient; but too much care cannot be exercised in controlling the conditions precedent to the establishment of the exchange. But we should not, in my judgment, permit these men to be the judges of their own integrity. I desire to place myself on record as favouring the idea of the exchange; of control by the Government, of supervision of the feeding, accommodation and care of the stock—because sometimes the stock does not receive the attention that it should; we all know that the animals sometimes go without water for a considerable length of time. After all, this matter is of as much public importance as the grain business; it touches what you might call the suffering of the animals, and in that respect it is important. The people with whom I have communicated are entirely in sympathy with this legislation; they are not anxious that the difficulties that were experienced in Winnipeg shall arise again. I repeat that we must eliminate that section which permits the men themselves to govern their own conduct and to determine their own integrity. Some other tribunal should determine whether a man who furnishes the necessary evidence should become a member of the organization—because once you get the monopolistic tendency developed; once you get a tendency to exclusiveness, a desire not to let in a man who wants to go into business, then you have trouble.

Mr. ROBB: Last fall throughout Southern Alberta the hotels were filled with buyers of sheep; they were simply tumbling over one another. Are we now going to change the conditions and compel all those men to go to certain stock yards and buy from commission merchants?

Mr. R. B. BENNETT: No; I am glad to assure the hon. member that such is not the case. This legislation does not in the slightest degree impede the free movement of those who desire to go out and buy sheep, horses, cattl , or anything else. If, on the other hand, men take their stock to the yards, as they do in Chicago, for instance, it is desirable that there should be an exchange, representing the controlling

authority with respect to buyers and sellers as distinguished from the stock yards company itself. I agree that we should not by legislation encourage or compel the lessening of the activities of those who desire to purchase live stock in competition with one another. The condition to which my hon. friend has alluded is one that obtained with reference to steers and beef cattle at a time when there was a shortage in the United States. You can buy where you like—in the field, in the hotel, in the village store;—but when the animals stop over night in the stock yards, as they often do, then the regulations with respect to stock yards obtain, and Government supervision is had. The animals must be adequately fed, properly cared for, sufficiently watered; and if there is buying and selling in that stock yard, it takes place under Government supervision and regulation. It is desirable, for that reason, that those who hold themselves out as commission merchants should not be permitted to exercise that business to the detriment of the farmer who trusts them. It is advisable that there should be some responsible body, such as an exchange, of which the commission merchant should become a member, thus ensuring that the money due to the farmer will be paid to him—because the exchange stands behind the farmer as a licensed buying and selling organization. That, and that only, is the intention of this Act.

10 p.m.

Mr. BURRELL: The purpose of the Bill, which was gone over very carefully after a long discussion with men interested, both from the East and from the West, is to try and prevent the very abuses to which reference has been made. I am aware that there is some feeling in the West in regard to the matter of an exchange. There is a live stock exchange in the United Stock Yards, Winnipeg; there is another at Toronto. In the United States business is done in the stock yards through the medium of an exchange, but there is no Government control. The simplest machinery to establish in respect to the buying and selling activities seems to be a live stock exchange. In encouraging or compelling its establishment, it was desirable to have thorough and complete control over its operations. In providing that they themselves should guarantee the integrity of a member of their exchange and supervise their own activities, it is thought that that would be the simplest and most efficient way of conducting the business. We allow them to take good deal of the responsibililty themselves, always with the understanding that, besides approving their by-laws, we maintain supervision over their operations. In this way we relieve ourselves of a good deal of work in connection with running the exchange. I do not think we could get away from the establishment of an exchange, association, or whatever you like to call it. I think the committee may be absolutely confident that the department will have full power to supervise the operations of the exchanges at all times and to prevent any abuses. In short, if there are any abuses, we can have quick investigation and, if necessary, suspend the exchange. This section which provides for the special licensing of commission men is inserted for the purpose of preventing a possible difficulty such as my hon. friend suggests. If any trouble or abuse by these live stock exchanges or groups of men arises, we can suspend the whole thing and issue a special license to such commission men as we think fit. I think we can cover the point brought forward by the hon. member for St. John (Mr. Pugsley) who is not now in his place, by adding a subsection to section 8. There would be no objection to inserting an amendment to section 3, but when we come to section 8, the whole point will be very clearly covered.

Mr. OLIVER: The minister apparently has made up his mind to the establishment of these exchanges. In my judgment, sections 3 and 4, if they have any meaning at all, mean the establishment of a close corporation of commission buyers at each of these stock yards. That is wrong in principle and detrimental in practice, just as in the case of the Grain Exchange at Winnipeg. It will be accentuated in the case of live stock exchanges, and the smaller the exchange the greater the evil of this creation of close corporations. The minister says that it will relieve the Government of some measure of detail in looking after the business of the stock yard. That is true, but it will do so to the very great advantage of the men who are doing the relieving. They are not philanthropists, and if they are going to exert themselves along those lines, they are going to do it for their own benefit, and that benefit must come out of the pockets of the producers. If sections 3 and 4 were struck out, the rest of the Bill would stand perfectly complete with the operations of the stock yards and the transactions of the commission

men directly under the control of the Government, and that is exactly where they ought to be. That being the case, I consider that sections 3 and 4 are not only superfluous, but detrimental. While the minister, I suppose, has made up his mind on this subject, I wish to make my most emphatic protest against those sections establishing live stock exchanges at those stock yards, as they will be close corporations, the purpose of which, in the nature of things, will be to work in the interest of those who comprise them and against the interest of the producers.

Mr. WRIGHT: The other evening when the Minister Agriculture introduced this Bill, I suggested that it should be turned over to the Agricultural Committee for consideration. I believe to-day the suggestion was a wise one, and I understand the Bill was fully threshed out before that committee—unfortunately I was unable to be present. The live stock interests in this country are to-day so great that they deserve and should receive every attention from the Government. The Bill as introduced by the minister is in the right direction. The hon. member for Edmonton (Mr. Oliver) asks that sections 3 and 4 should be struck out. I would draw his attention to one fact;—had this Bill been in force, I believe it would have been unnecessary to say what I am about to say. That exchange is to-day financially bankrupt and is appealing for funds. Had this Bill been in force, had the department been able to exercise their rights, this would not have happened. Whilst hon. gentlemen opposite have every right to criticise and it is their province to criticise, I think they should withdraw all opposition to this Bill and allow it to go through as printed, with the addition of the amendments suggested by the minister.

Mr. OLIVER: I have stated my objections and do not intend to press them further. There was just one other thing I wished to point out, namely, that as the Bill stands there is no security provided to the producer of cattle, the man who sells cattle to the commission merchant. All the security that any body has is the provision that the stock association shall be satisfied that the commission merchant is reliable. That is to some extent a safeguard, but it is not security. There would be no less security if only such buyers operated on the stock yards as the minister saw fit to license, as provided under section 5, and we would be just as well satisfied that the commission merchants licensed by the minister directly would meet their obligations as we would in regard to those who are admitted to membership in a live stock exchange as being men of character and repute. There is no guarantee to the seller in the provisions of this Bill as there is in the provisions of the Grain Act under similar circumstances.

Mr. NESBITT: My hon. friend has pointed out a weakness in the Bill. I do not like section 5, because really the exchanges ought to be held responsible in some way. Nobody should be specially licensed by the minister as a commission merchant on an exchange without the consent of the exchange, and the exchange should be held responsible for such commission merchant.

Mr. BURRELL: While I quite appreciate what the hon. member for Edmonton (Mr. Oliver) says, I am sorry I cannot agree with him, for this reason: I think we have absolute control, and there is entire safety provided under these sections for the producers and sellers of live stock, because of the evidence of integrity and the security which has to be offered to the exchanges who will run this business under our supervision. Before a live stock exchange can do any of these things, we have to be absolutely satisfied with their constitution and by-laws, to ensure that they will carry on their business properly.

Our regulations cover all these points, and if there is any trouble or any difficulty, or if there is any complaint made of abuses such as my hon. friend anticipates we would have the right to close up that exchange and issue special licenses to commission men to do business notwithstanding the fact that the live stock exchange was closed. I do not think that sections 4 and 5 can be withdrawn. I may say this Bill was gone over very carefully with men who are very keenly appreciative of difficulties such as my hon. friend suggests. One of the men who most strongly urged this feature of the Bill was Dr. Rutherford, whom my hon. friend knows well. Dr. Rutherford is President of the Western Live Stock Union and was formerly Veterinary Director General. I feel certain he is as familiar as any man living with stock conditions in the West. The Saskatchewn Government appointed a live sock commission to examine these conditions, and they laid very great stress on the same points. These clauses were drafted after consultation with various people who know the conditions thoroughly, and after consultation with our own officers. I therefore think I should hardly

be justified in amending them or altering them at this time. I do not really anticipate the difficulties my hon. friend fears, and I can assure him that every precaution will be taken by the department to see that the public is protected to the very limit.

Mr. NESBITT: I think this Bill is a great step in the right direction. Subsection 2 of section 4 will have a tendency not only to regulate the exchanges, but to make them more reliable. At the same time, it does not provide for the complete financial responsibility of a commission man who has a right to operate on the exchange. For instance, if I ship a carload of steers to a commission man to sell, there is nothing in this subsection making the exchange responsible for that commission man in regard to the price of the stock. That is what I meant by not allowing anybody to operate except such commission men as were permitted to do so by the exchange, and then making the exchange financially responsible for them. I do not mean as to the charges, the weighing, the feed, etc—I mean responsibility for the price of the stock.

Mr. MORPHY: I do not quite agree with my hon. friend from North Oxford (Mr. Nesbitt). The hon. member for Edmonton (Mr. Oliver) wished section 4 to be struck out. To my mind that section contains the very thing he desires. The section reads as follows:

(2) Such by-laws shall provide for the admission as members of such live stock exchange of such persons as desire to carry on the business of commission merchants, and who furnish evidence of integrity and financial standing satisfactory to the executive of the exchange, and such by-laws shall require every commission merchant becoming a member of the exchange to furnish sufficient and satisfactory security for the proper accounting by such commission merchant of the proceeds of any sales received by him, and of any money paid to him to effect any purchase.

What language could be stronger? Of course, it all depends upon the nature of the security they take, but the presumption is they will insist upon security that will be sufficient, to cover the operations of any members of the exchange, and I would assume that if they could not get personal security which is absolutely gilt-edged they would get other security which would guarantee the purchasers. That section is about as strong as language can make it.

Mr. GLASS: The criticism offered by the hon. member for North Oxford was duly considered by the committee. Subsection 2 of section 4 was explained by the minister, and seemed to offer sufficient security to the drover who might have cattle to sell on the exchange. The details as to what that security shall be, or what the character of the responsibility shall be are not embodied in the Bill, but the primary object is to give the security the hon. member seeks, and this clause supplemented, by the regulations of the minister and the department and the by-laws of the exchange, which must be approved by the minister, seems to me to furnish that security. Of course, it all depends on the stringency of the regulations which the minister imposes. I am sure the committee had confidence that the minister would impose conditions that would give absolute security, knowing the necessity for it.

Mr. R. B. BENNETT: After considering the matter with practical men, and hearing what my hon. friend from Edmonton had to say, I would suggest to the minister that after the word "merchants," in the third line of subsection 2 of section 4, we add the words "on such terms and conditions as may be fixed by the by-laws." This change would meet the difficulty referred to by my hon. friend from Edmonton, and instead of leaving it open to the executive to do as they pleased would provide that any man who complies with the by-laws would be a member. Does not my hon. friend from Edmonton think that would get over the difficulty?

Mr. OLIVER: Of course, they frame the by-laws.

Mr. R. B. BENNETT: But the minister has to approve of them. Then the responsibility is on the Government.

Mr. OLIVER: I think that would be an improvement.

Mr. BURRELL: I have no objection at all to that amendment. I really thought we were achieving the purpose with the subsection as it was, but on further consideration, I agree, it might sound as if these men were judging of the integrity of their own members. I therefore move:

That subsection 2 of section 4 be amended by striking out all the words in line 4 and the words in line 5, to and including the word "exchange," and inserting in lieu thereof "on such terms and conditions as may be prescribed by the by-laws."

Amendment agreed to, and section as amended agreed to.

On section 7—Tariff of fees and by-laws must be approved before stock yard is used:

Mr. BURRELL moved that the words "and charges" be inserted after the word "fees" in the third line of the clause and the words "and charges" after the word "fees" in the eighth line.

Amendment agreed to.

On section 7, subsection 2—Stock yard may be closed when not operated in accordance with regulations:

Mr. MORPHY: I think the wording of this subsection is rather restrictive. There might be a stock yard in charge of some one who was not the "owner" or "operator." I could imagine a case where a stock yard might have gone into disuse for a little while and there would be no person on whom notice could be served who might be called the owner or operator. I would suggest that the word "owner," "lessee, occupier or operator" should be used.

Mr. BURRELL: There would be no objection to putting that in. I therefore move that the section be amended by inserting after the word "owner" in the first line the words "lessee, occupier or operator;" that the words "lessee, occupier" be inserted after the word "owner" in the 34th line and that the words "lessee, occupier or operator" be inserted after the word "owner" in the 38th line.

Amendment agreed to, and section as amended agreed to.

On section 8—How Act may be made applicable to stock yards now in existence:

Mr. BURRELL: To meet the point raised by the hon. member for St. John (Mr. Pugsley) and the hon. member for North Perth (Mr. Morphy), I beg to move that the following subsection be added:

The minister shall have power to decide whether any public market where live stock is purchased and sold, hereafter established, as a stock yard is to be operated under this Act.

Mr. OLIVER: I understood an amendment was inserted after section 3 to provide that any owner of stock could sell his own stock at any stock yard. Is there any restriction on any person coming to the stock yard to buy?

Mr. BURRELL: No, I should think not.

Mr. OLIVER: Last winter buyers came from Seattle.

Mr. BURRELL: I should think there would be absolutely no restriction.

[Mr. Burrell.]

Mr. OLIVER: The establishment of a stock exchange would not prevent outside buyers coming to the stock yards and buying?

Mr. BURRELL: No. The intention was to control only the commission side of it.

Section as amended agreed to.

Bill reported, and read the third time and passed.

SALE OF INTOXICATING LIQUORS.

Consideration of amendments made by the Senate to Bill No. 121, an Act to amend an Act in aid of provincial legislation prohibiting or restricting the sale or use of intoxicating liquors.—Mr. Doherty.

Mr. GRAHAM: This is a funny Government. I mean it is made up of funny members. They tell us at six o'clock what they are going to take up at eight o'clock, and then they take up something else. We were told at six that we would take up to-night the Live stock Bill and then Estimates, and now the Minister of Justice comes along with a temperance measure. Perhaps it is inoffensive and we may let him go; but I call attention to the fact that about four times a week the Government take up business other than that of which they have given notice.

Mr. DOHERTY: I am sorry if my hon. friend finds this measure offensive. I shall explain it briefly and then he can get to his Estimates. This is a measure that has come back from the Senate with amendments that, I may be pardoned for saying, do not, in my judgment, improve it.

Mr. LEMIEUX: About the papers?

Mr. DOHERTY: The hon. member says, "about the papers." The hon. gentlemen in the place which perhaps I should not discuss seemed to be under the same misapprehension as the hon. member for Rouville, that this is a Bill about the papers; and so they have struck out a provision in section 2 of the Bill which simply provided that it should be an offence to use the post office as a means of violating constitutionally enacted provincial laws. As I am informed, they have interpreted that as being legislation by this Parliament to prohibit the circulation of newspapers containing liquor advertisements, because it was possible that a province might prohibit that. The section in question simply declared that it should be an offence to use the post office as a messenger for the violation of properly enacted provincial law. The Senate have struck that out because, I presume, in their

judgment it is a proper thing that His Majesty's mails should be used as a means of the violation of properly enacted provincial law. The prohibition of such use was the full extent of the offending section.

Mr. LEMIEUX: Did not the Senate give the right interpretation to that penalty clause? I think that in this House I called attention to the fact that it would be hard to keep the papers in line, that papers like the Montreal Gazette, the Montreal Star, and all the large dailies published in Montreal could by that legislation be prevented from circulating in the province of Ontario, for instance, unless they gave up the advertising of famous brands. It might be that the provinces would not prohibit the circulation of papers containing such advertisements; but, on the other hand, they might. But now the Senate, full of apprehension, thought, in its wisdom, that such a cruel clause should not be inserted in the Bill. I do not say that I would like to curtail the power of the provinces to prohibit.

Mr. SPEAKER: I regret to interrupt the hon. gentleman, but the Minister of Justice (Hon. Mr. Doherty) has the floor; we are not in committee.

Mr. PUGSLEY: Will the hon. minister explain the amendment?

Mr. DOHERTY: It simply strikes out the clause which made it an offence for anyone to use His Majesty's mail as an instrument for the violation of provincial laws. It is quite true that the hon. gentleman, when the Bill was before this House, pointed out that, if the provinces prohibited a newspaper circulating within the province on the ground that it contained a liquor advertisement, the effect of this legislation would be to make it an offence to use the post office to circulate that newspaper. That would be true, and the circulation would be prevented, not by means of this legislation, but by means of the legislation of the province enacted within its constitutional right. All that this legislation would have done, if it had taken effect, would be to deprive people of the right of using the post office to violate the provincial laws. The effect of striking this section out of this Bill would be this: Suppose a province passes legislation prohibiting the distribution of circulars advertising the sale of liquor, any person will be guilty of an offence who himself circulates, or hires a messenger to circulate, such advertisement, but provided he puts it in an envelope, puts a stamp on it, and hires the post office to circulate it, he will be an innocent man. That is the effect of the refusal of the Senate to enact this legislation. I cannot say I am prepared to accept that amendment. On the other hand, the Senate has left in this Bill two provisions which are valuable, and, for that reason, I do not propose to ask the House to reject these amendments. Sooner than lose the benefit of these provisions left in the measure, I do not purpose to endeavour—which endeavour I have no reason to suppose would be successful—to induce the Senate to reconsider its action with regard to the amendment nor with regard to another which I will mention later. I purpose to ask this House rather to concur in these amendments. If I should have the opportunity, I shall certainly make a further endeavour to have so reasonable an enactment as was contained in the struck-out clause re-enacted, and give the Senate some future opportunity of reconsidering their action in the matter.

Mr. GRAHAM: Supposing these circulars were mailed in the United States to people in Canada, would the law, as contemplated by the minister, reach the case?

Mr. DOHERTY: Of course, it is not possible for us to enact a law to make it an offence for a man to do anything in the United States.

Mr. GRAHAM: But when it came over here?

Mr. DOHERTY: The law was enacted against the person who used the post office. It was not proposed—and I do not think it would be wise—to exercise a censorship over letters, and have the post office authorities open every letter, on the chance of finding a circular in it. We made it an offence to use the post office for the circulation of liquor advertisements when such circulation is prohibited in a province. In the nature of things, we cannot make it an offence for a man to do certain things in the United States; we cannot reach him. I believe this legislation would have reached a man who, through the medium of people in the United States, used our post office for that purpose, and I understand abuses are perpetrated in that way, to evade the war stamp. Representations were made that people sent in immense bundles of liquor advertisements, and posted them in the United States, because they could be sent for 2 cents instead of 3 cents. The other

amendment is also by way of striking out the provision which enabled the prosecution of any one who violated this law, by sending liquor into a prohibition province from an outside province, to be instituted at the place whence the liquor was sent. It is the second time this House has enacted that provision. Last year the Senate struck it out in the same way. That, too, is an amendment which, I must confess, I would describe myself as submitting to, rather than accepting. I think the section was essential to the proper enforcement of the law. But, for the same reason, I do not propose to ask the House to reject it. I do not look upon the third amendment as open to criticism. I refer to section 4 B. The section as it passed this House gave a right of search for liquor in cases where a violation of the law was suspected, to any constable or other peace officer who had reason to believe that any intoxicating liquor was in any premises or place, in violation of the provisions of the Act. The Senate has thought it wise—and I do not purpose to offer any observation on that amendment—to make that right of search subject to information being laid, and to it being established before any judge of the sessions of the peace, recorder, police magistrate, stipendiary magistrate, two justices of the peace, or any magistrate having the power or authority of two or more justices of the peace, that there is reasonable cause to suspect that the liquor is within the premises. I do not desire to offer any criticism of that, but will be prepared to accept it.

I move that the amendments be concurred in, without withdrawing the observations I have made with regard to the first two amendments.

Mr. PUGSLEY: The amendments seem to be so important and so contrary to the views of the temperance people throughout the county, that I should think the minister, entertaining the strong views he does upon the question, would prefer to avail himself of the power which is conferred by the rules and practice of Parliament, of having a conference between members of this House, to be appointed for the purpose, and a committee of the Senate, for the purpose of fully discussing the matter with a view to seeing if the section could not be agreed to as it was passed by the House, or at all events, if a section substantially to the same effect could not be adopted, which might, to a reasonable extent, accomplish the object the Government had in framing the section. It seems to me that my hon. friend ought not to abandon the matter just now by concurring in the amendment which has been made by the Senate in the striking out of this section.

Mr. DOHERTY: If I had any ground for believing that the conference—

Mr. PUGSLEY: My hon. friend does not know what his persuasive powers might accomplish.

Mr. DOHERTY: I have endeavoured to exercise them so often on the member for St. John with so little success that I have almost begun to lose faith in them. Speaking seriously, if I had hoped that the desired result would be obtained, I certainly would have followed the course which the hon. member suggests. But I have excellent reasons for believing that it would not produce the effect which my hon. friend, and I with him, would like to see produced. On the other hand, we have by this legislation, even as it stands, a clause with regard to search which is a great improvement on the law as it stood. We have furthermore a clause which is a great improvement and which has been urged on me by the temperance people in different provinces. This clause makes possible the suspension of the Canada Temperance Act, without resorting to another election, in counties where it is now in force and where the prohibitory law of the province is, in the judgment of the Governor in Council, as restrictive as the Canada Temperance Act. I think that the probability of concurrence by the Senate in the clause that they have struck out is so remote as not to justify our running any risk of losing what they have left to us of the Bill—which, I think, is of value.

Mr. PUGSLEY: There would be no risk of losing what has been enacted. If nothing resulted from the conference, we should still have the other features of the Bill.

Mr. DOHERTY: Yes, if we got it through in sufficient time to deal with the matter again in this House.

Mr. PUGSLEY: There is quite enough time.

Mr. DOHERTY: There are other things to do.

Motion agreed to, and amendments concurred in.

BUSINESS OF THE HOUSE.

On the order being called: House again in Committee of Supply:

Mr. GRAHAM: It is eleven o'clock, and we sat late last night. I suggest that we do not go on with Supply.

Mr. DOHERTY: I do not want to insist upon our proceeding, if hon. gentlemen are very desirous of getting away, I simply wished to deal with a few supplementary estimates for the Department of Justice and the Post Office Department.

Mr. GRAHAM: We will put them through quickly some other time.

Mr. DOHERTY: Is that a promise?

Mr. GRAHAM: It is a threat.

On the motion of Hon. Mr. Doherty for the adjournment of the House:

Mr. GRAHAM: What business will be taken up to-morrow? It has been rumoured that the Government intend to ask the House to sit to-morrow night. Several gentlemen from both sides of the House have made engagements for to-morrow night, and I would ask the minister if the Government have decided as to an evening a sitting.

Mr. DOHERTY: With regard to the first question, I understand that we shall take up the Franchise Act to-morrow. It has been the desire to sit to-morrow evening; perhaps I might undertake to consult with those who are in higher authority than myself and to give the hon. gentlemen an answer early in the morning.

Mr. LEMIEUX: While the minister is in his place, I may say that when I was last in Montreal several people—

Mr. SPEAKER: I hope the hon: gentlemen is not going to introduce a new subject. The motion for the adjournment of the House does not permit a word of debate. The practice has grown up in the House of permitting a question upon the motion for adjournment as to what business will be taken up the next day. I hope that the hon. gentlemen is not going to introduce a new matter; he would be entirely out of order in doing so.

Mr. LEMIEUX: I will see the Minister of Justice personally.

Motion agreed to, and the House adjourned at 11.02 p.m.

Saturday, September 8, 1917.

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

MANUFACTURE OF MUNITIONS.

MOTION TO ADJOURN THE HOUSE ON A DEFINITE MATTER OF URGENT PUBLIC IMPORTANCE.

On the Orders of the Day:

Mr. E. M. MACDONALD (Pictou): Mr. Speaker, I desire to move, seconded by Mr. Marcil, for leave to move the adjournment of the House for the purpose of discussing a definite matter of urgent public importance: The necessity of supplying munitions to Great Britain during the continuance of the war in view of the fact that they are being decreased and stoppage of the same is threatened.

Mr. SPEAKER: The hon. member for Pictou (Mr. Macdonald) desires to move, seconded by Mr. Marcil, for leave to move the adjournment of the House for the purpose of discussing a definite matter of urgent public importance: The necessity of supplying munitions to Great Britain during the continuance of the war in view of the fact that they are being decreased and stoppage of the same is threatened.

I may say with reference to this proposed motion, that it is competent for me to rule that it is not a matter of such importance as to properly be discussed under rule 39. On the other hand, when I have a doubt in my mind, it is my duty to submit the motion to the consideration of the House. Many considerations present themselves to me. One is that the subject of munitions has been discussed at various times during the present session. The one feature of the case that leaves a doubt in my mind is that the supply of munitions has recently been curtailed. The interpretation which has been placed upon the rule is that a definite matter of urgent public importance must be one of recent occurrence. The circumstance that the decrease in munition supplies has been recent leaves a doubt in my mind as to whether the hon. gentleman ought not properly to have the right to present his motion to the House. Having that doubt in my mind, I think I should give the benefit of the doubt to the hon. member and afford him the opportunity of presenting his motion. That being the case I purpose submitting the question to the House as to whether the hon. member shall have leave to move this motion.

Right Hon. Sir GEORGE FOSTER: (Minister of Trade and Commerce): Mr. Speaker, under ordinary circumstances, I would not make any objection to a motion of this kind although there is a doubt in my mind as to whether this constitutes such a question of urgent public importance as to justify the House in interrupting its course of necessary business in order to give up the time which will be consumed by this discussion. The matter referred to in the hon. gentleman's motion is:

> The necessity of supplying munitions to Great Britain during the continuance of the war in view of the fact that they are being decreased and the stoppage of the same is threatened.

There is no doubt that this is an important question to various interests in the Dominion of Canada. If the decrease in munitions as manufactured and supplied from Canada, does not result in a decrease of effective and aggressive power at the front there is no Imperial menace and no menace to the Allies or to the Empire. There is no doubt in my mind—I do not imagine that there is any in the mind of any hon. member of this House—that whatever variation or restriction in kinds of munitions which have heretofore been made in Canada and the manufacture of which will be gradually decreased is well within the ken of the British Government and will be decided with absolute regard to the necessity for these munitions of war at the front. Therefore, it is a matter only of comparative urgency, simply to certain interests in the Dominion of Canada—

Mr. MACDONALD: Mr. Speaker, I rise to a point of order. I submit that under the rule of procedure, it is open to my right hon. friend (Sir George Foster) to take objection, but not to argue the question.

Mr. SPEAKER: As I understand, the right hon. member who is leading the House (Sir George Foster) purposes making an objection, and he is laying the groundwork for that objection. Otherwise he would not be in order in speaking at this stage.

Mr. PUGSLEY: Under the recently applied closure rule the discussion of this motion is not in order.

Mr. SPEAKER: This is not the closure.

Mr. PUGSLEY: But the closure rules apply.

Mr. SPEAKER: A certain amount of latitude will always be allowed by me to the leader of the Government or to the leader of the Opposition in addressing the House or in giving reasons for taking a certain position. While the right hon. the leader of the House, as I understand, proposes to make an objection, I think it is but right that he should have opportunity to lay the basis for it.

[The Speaker.]

Sir GEORGE FOSTER: I had no other idea than to make an objection but I wish to give point to my objection by laying the groundwork. I have given one reason why I make objection, but there is another and a still more urgent one. This House has been in session for six months; we are approaching within four weeks of the time when the term of Parliament will expire by effluxion. We have very important business now on the Order Paper which we proposed to go on with this day. This motion is interposed. I think it is a matter of relative urgency, which the House should take into consideration, as between this motion and the measure which is before the House taking into account that it has to be passed through this House, and through the Senate, and that the time is very short in which to do that. I think the relative urgency is altogether in favour of going on with the regularly proposed business of the House. Furthermore, and stronger still, it is the wish of this House, and it has so been expressed that as soon as possible the country may come to a decision as to the point at issue. It is impossible for the country to have a basis of coming to a decision, unless we have a franchise measure and provision for the preparation of the lists passed by both Houses, for the country to give its decision upon. That is absolutely necessary. When these great matters absolutely necessary to the decision of the country are pending, why should we interpose with a subsidiary matter and one of less relative urgency? It is on these grounds, which might be amplified if it were necessary for me to do it—hon. gentlemen can see the point for themselves—that I object to the time and business of this House being broken into by the discussion of a question, the discussion of which cannot come to any final issue and which precludes the attention of the House being given to matters of infinitely greater urgency and more essential importance.

Right Hon. Sir WILFRID LAURIER: As to the latter objection which my right hon. friend (Sir George Foster) takes, that it is important to proceed with the consideration of the Franchise Bill which is

now before the House, I have only to say that we have a Franchise Act already and that we do not require any Franchise Bill at all. The measure which has been introduced is not at all an improvement in the Franchise Act which we have on the statute book. I think it is a distinctly retrograde step to interfere with the Franchise Act which we already have. However, that is only by the way. As to the motion of my hon. friend from Pictou (Mr. Macdonald) you, Sir, have taken the objection that the matter of munitions has been very often discussed during the present sessions. It has, but it has never been discussed from the point of view that is now raised by my hon. friend from Pictou. We have discussed this matter from different points of view but it now takes on an entirely new aspect from the fact that we are threatened with a suspension or cessation of the manufacture of munitions. That is the point to which my hon. friend wants to call the attention of the House. If it be true that the manufacture of munitions is about to cease in Canada, may I not suggest to you, Sir, that there is no subject of more importance to-day not only to the Imperial forces and the Imperial cause but to the Canadian people themselves than the matter which has been brought to the attention of the House by my hon. friend. Everybody knows that the manufacture of munitions is about the only industry living and prospering at the present time in Canada and if it ceases altogether economic questions of the greatest importance must be taken into consideration. It is for these reasons that I say that the motion of my hon. friend is perfectly in order. It directs the attention of the House to the question of munitions from a point of view from which it has not been considered before and it is highly desirable that we should have the consensus of the House on this matter.

Mr. SPEAKER: Objection is taken by the right hon. the leader of the House (Sir George Foster) to the motion presented by the hon. member for Pictou. It is my duty to ask the House to decide whether it will accept the objection taken by the right hon. the leader of the House or whether it will permit the hon. member to proceed. Objection having been taken, I will ask those hon. members who support the motion to rise in their places.

And more than twenty members having risen in their places:

Mr. SPEAKER: I call upon the hon. member for Pictou (Mr. Macdonald) to proceed with the motion.

Mr. MACDONALD: Mr. Speaker, I have no apology to make to the House or the country for directing the attention of Parliament this afternoon to this important matter. We have on various occasions in the past, when questions of this kind have come up for discussion, been told that they were not proper matters for the consideration of Parliament. I do not know upon what ground that suggestion is made because any one who follows the deliberations of the Imperial Parliament has seen that the methods of producing munitions and the arrangements for their supply are subjects often discussed in that Parliament. No subject has engaged the attention of the British Parliament to the same extent as this question of the organization of the nation for the purpose of obtaining its munition supply. In every nation which has engaged in this war, in every overseas dominion that has played its part at the front and has had anything to do with furnishing supplies, either food supplies or munitions for the purpose of enabling the fight to be effectively carried on, the problems of this service have always been regarded as of the first importance. In view of the fact, Sir, that we have been told that this country should be congratulated upon the wonderful part it has played in providing munitions of war in the past, when we are reaching a stage when the industry and the production are being absolutely menaced, if not actually and completely effaced, I am surprised that the leader of the House should venture to say that this is not a matter of prime importance.

My right hon. friend the leader of the House seems to be one of those gentlemen who, after they have expressed themselves with regard to the war, with that broad Tory spirit which has always been characteristic of him, think that, no matter what the views of other hon. gentlemen may be as to what Canada should do in the war, they have no right to open their mouths. I have as much right to express my opinion as to what Canada should do in this war as has the right hon. gentleman, or any other hon. gentleman.

What are the facts in regard to this matter? Shortly after the war began this country was supposed to be in no position to produce munitions. There arose this great industry at a time of the great depression in Canada in the fall of 1914, which has given employment to thousands of men and women throughout the country. As the result of that industry, we have been able to send to Great Britain thousands of shells

of the most effective type and of the best possible construction, which have been of the most material assistance to the Allies and to the homeland in the fight in Flanders and elsewhere. Now we find that within the last two weeks the intimation has gone abroad that those industries have in a great many cases absolutely discontinued the manufacture of shells. Great numbers of men and women have been discharged from employment. Many of these men are not of military age, but they were giving their best service to the country in the war. The women also were playing a great part by helping to produce munitions. Under those conditions I am astonished at the right hon. gentleman having the audacity to say to the House and the country that we have no right to discuss the question of the stoppage of that production. Not only have we been sending shells of different varieties, but we have been sending steel ingots from which the shells were being forged on the other side of the Atlantic. I understand the situation in Canada to be that a great number of the industries which have been producing certain types of shells have been notified that they must stop altogether. This notification comes without the slightest preliminary warning. Large amounts of capital have been invested in these industries, and machines of all kinds have been obtained and put to work. People who were dependent upon these industries for employment and for their livelihood have been laid aside without any notice whatever. There is no suggestion of compensation either to the people who have their capital invested or to the workers who have been depending upon the industry for their livelihood. Without a word of warning they are notified that no more shells will be produced.

What is the reason of this? There has been no large discussion upon this shell question during this session of Parliament. Whenever hon. gentlemen on this side of the House ventured to mention the matter we were told it was a matter of Imperial concern, which is not correct for it is largely a question of Canadian concern. On 25th August last I asked the right hon. gentleman who leads the House (Sir George Foster) for some information in regard to the matter, and he said:

Sir George Foster: I should prefer that the full answer be given by the Minister of Finance or the Prime Minister, but if there be any stoppage of the manufacture of shells in this country or any diminution, as I believe there is to be, it is because the variety of shell whose manufacture will be diminished or discontinued is not now needed from Canada, as they are able to produce them in sufficient quantities in Great Britain.

That is all the hon. gentleman knew of this important question two weeks ago. Has he learned anything further about it since? The Minister of Finance (Sir Thomas White), on the following Monday, made a further statement in regard to the matter, and in the course of that statement, he said, as reported in Hansard of that day:

The minister—

That is, the Imperial Minister of Munitions.

—has now advised that it is unnecessary to continue production in Canada on the present scale. He has directed that certain lines shall be discontinued; that other lines shall be produced in lessened quantities; while some lines are to be continued as at present.

The effect of this will be to stop the production of shells and components at some plants which are now producing sizes no longer required.

The manufacture of the larger shells has been discontinued. The orders for these small shells have been coming in, but it is impossible to maintain these industries, or to continue their organization, under these conditions. The result is that the production of shells in Canada is to be stopped altogether. The Minister of Finance went further and said:

These changes have been anticipated by several important firms, who have already resumed, or are planning to resume, their pre-war activities in their own lines.

In all these steel industries there were no pre-war activities. Under the régime of hon. gentlemen opposite, in the summer of 1914, the steel industries of this country were closing their doors. Perhaps my hon. friend's policy will bring about the same condition again. He does not care whether shells are produced in Canada and sent to Great Britain, as long as he gets his Franchise Bill put through. The Government, through its inaction, is bringing back the pre-war condition, the pre-war lack of work and bread, which existed in this country previous to 1914, without attempting to provide a remedy. My hon. friend went on to say:

During July, we advanced $35,000,000; during August we are advancing $35,000,000, and we have arranged to continue the advances of $25,000,000 a month, during September, October, November and December, so that the Dominion Government will continue to make the advances which we have been making in the past.

If hon. gentlemen in this House or any gentleman in the country can tell us, from

these two explanations, what the attitude of the Government is in regard to this business, I hope he will do so. For myself I confess an inability to gather it. The situation is that the shell industry in Canada has been stopped, and why? Is it because shells are not needed across the ocean, where the war, in all its cruelty and fierceness, is proceeding with greater intensity than in previous times? The demand for shells is just as great now as ever. Are we in Canada going to stop supplying shells? If so, why? We must remember that the history of this whole question of shell production in Canada is this: The Government, through the original committee, proceeded to form an organization which allotted contracts and initiated the shell production. That was carried on for some time. Then we had the Imperial Munitions Board. But nothing has been initiated by this Government in any way in connection with shell production. Why should we not ascertain where we are in regard to this matter? Is the Government going to move in it, or is it not? What course was pursued in Great Britain? There they had a registration of the man-power of the nation, and they nationalized the shell industry. Every shell manufactory was taken over by the Government, and operated by them. It is a well-known fact that a great number of men were brought back from the front in order to engage in the shell industry in Great Britain, while a large number of women of the old land were engaged in these industries. Is it because there are plenty of shells being made in Great Britain, that they do not require assistance from outside? If that is the reason, the country should know it. If there is any other reason the country should know it. Is it because of any financial reason? In this connection I would call the attention of the House to a speech made by Mr. Rowell, as reported in the press, in which he gives a financial reason for the stoppage of the manufacture of shells.

> Britain is giving her orders for munitions to the United States and our workers are threatened with closing down, for why? Because Great Britain has now come to the point where she cannot possibly pay in gold, after the great assistance she has given to the allies and she must purchase on credit. The United States can sell her on these conditions, and why should not Canada be able to do likewise?

I think the question asked by Mr. Rowell is a very pertinent one. The discussion to ascertain where we stand on this matter was absolutely necessary. Will the Minister of Trade and Commerce, or will the Minister of Finance, tell us that the situation is that, by reason of financial arrangements by Great Britain, she is now purchasing shells in the United States, while, by reason of no financial arrangement having been made by Canada, Britain is not going to purchase them in Canada? If these are the reasons we ought to know it; because if financial arrangements can be made under which this industry can be continued, such arrangements ought to be made, for Canada, and our people should be called upon, if necessary, to make sacrifices to that end. What has been the position for the last three years? All over this country, by reason of the shell industry, and the tremendous amounts of money that have been paid to those who work in that industry, we have had prosperity in every industrial centre, which prosperity has helped the Minister of Finance to swell his revenues and has provided the money with which his loans were taken up and our patriotic funds maintained. All these things were largely due to the shell manufacture and its correlative industries. Every iron and steel industry in this country that could produce shells has been working overtime; they have been disregarding the production of staple articles in order to engage in the manufacture of shells. Are these activities to be stopped? Is this country to be thrown back to where it was in 1914?

Is the question one of transportation? Tremendous injury has been inflicted upon the shipping of allied and neutral nations by the German submarine campaign, and the suggestion has been made in some quarters that that accounts for the difficulty experienced in transporting shells. While the shell itself is not being exported, I understand that Great Britain is still importing from the United States and Canada large quantities of steel ingots, out of which the shell is bored. If this raw material can be transported in large quantities, there is no reason why the shell itself cannot be transported. It does not weigh as much as the ingot, and it does not take up as much room; so that the argument made with regard to the difficulty of transportation does not prevail. If shells are needed at the front and if they can be transported as easily as shell steel can be transported, what justification is there for the present condition in respect of the manufacture of shells in Canada?

I have referred to the advantages which have come to Canada as a result of this industry. Those advantages are well known; why should they be swept away?

If the question of finance is not at the bottom of it, why has the Minister of Finance made the statement that he has made? Why have we had the statements that have been made in the matter by Mr. Rowell? Is it a fact that this country is not in a position to supply the money for the production of shells in Canada? Great Britain is paying the cost of the maintenance of our troops overseas. Instead of sending money across to pay those bills, we have been paying for the production of shells sent across the ocean. Is that practice to be discontinued? If Canada is in this way to stop paying what she owes to Great Britain, the people ought to know it; such a course would be a grave mistake on the part of the financial people of Canada. Is the shell industry of Canada to be allowed to become extinct? Men over military age have mortgaged their properties in order that they might engage in the shell business; are they to be told, upon a week's notice, that the whole of the product of their capital is worth nothing? Are the machines that have been used in the shell industry all over Canada to be scrapped? What is going to happen to my hon. friend's business profits tax? He will have to revise his estimate of the amount of money that he will receive during the year 1917 if the business profits of the men who have been engaged in the shell industry are to be swept away for the remainder of the year.

The method adopted of dealing with the production of shells in Canada is not satisfactory. There should be no Imperial Munitions Board in this country; Canada should herself deal with the problem of manufacturing shells. Canada should do what Great Britain did: take over and operate the shell factories. If the shell industry is to be destroyed it is not because shells are not required at the front; there must be some other reason. I represent a constituency in which 2,000 men are thrown out of employment, a great number of them men over military age, who now have no means of livelihood—and we are on the threshold of another winter. This matter is one of most urgent importance. I want to know, first, whether this country is to have its hands tied; whether it is to go out of the business of helping the Allies in the war through the production of shells. I want to know, secondly, why it is that men who have invested capital in this industry are to lose their money; that workmen who have been dependent upon this industry for their livelihood are to be thrown out of employment. I want to know whether Mr. Rowell was right when he said yesterday in Toronto that Great Britain had made an arrangement with the United States under which Great Britain should purchase supplies in that country, not by payment in gold, but through the medium of credit. If the United States can sell to Great Britain under these conditions, why should Canada not be able to do so? It was in order that this important matter might be discussed that I moved the adjournment of the House. The men who have invested capital in this industry want to know why they should be struck down at one blow; the men who have been employed in the making of shells want to know why they should be put out of work when there is great need for shells across the ocean. Hon. gentlemen opposite, during the last two and a half years, have been laying the flattering unction to their souls that prosperity has come to Canada through the war, particularly through the manufacture of shells, and have claimed unlimited credit from the people. Yet when the shell industry is discontinued the matter is not of importance to them; Parliament, in their view, should not devote an hour and a half to its consideration.

Parliament has a right to know frankly and fully from this Government what they are going to do in regard to this matter. Are there difficulties which cannot be solved? Are the conditions insurmountable? Is Canada not to play her full part through the production of munitions in assisting Great Britain and the Allies to the utmost of her industrial ability? Is she not to provide employment for the older men and for the women who are compelled to remain at home?

Sir THOMAS WHITE (Minister of Finance): Mr. Speaker, although I am of opinion that it was entirely unnecessary for my hon. friend (Mr. Macdonald) to bring this matter to the attention of the House, a full statement having previously been made respecting it, I desire to make a very brief reply. On August 27, I stated, in reply to a question by the hon. member for South York (Mr. W. F. Maclean) with reference to this matter, that the Imperial Munitions Board, which represents the British Government in the placing of munition orders in Canada, had handed out to the press the following explanation with

regard to the production of munitions in this country on a slightly different scale from what had prevailed hitherto:

Ottawa, 21st August, 1917.

Towards the close of 1916 the capacity for producing munitions in Great Britain had so increased that the Minister of Munitions advised that it was unnecessary to continue the production of munitions in the United States for British account, except for a few special lines. The production in Canada, however, was continued as before.

The minister has now advised that it is unnecessary to continue production in Canada on the present scale. He has directed that certain lines shall be discontinued; that other lines shall be produced in lessened quantities; while some lines are to be continued as at present.

The effect of this will be to stop the production of shells and components at some plants which are now producing sizes no longer required. In other plants, where shells are made of sizes of which a reduced output only is required, it will mean working during the day only, thus stopping night work. In other plants, however, where sustained production is required, operations will be continued night as well as day.

These changes have been anticipated by several important firms, who have already resumed, or are planning to resume, their prewar activities in their own lines, while others are engaged in the production or preparation for production, of equipment needed for ships now under construction or to be built during 1918.

The reasons for the diminution of shell orders is clearly set forth in that statement. It is no doubt within the knowledge of the House that, by reason of the exchange situation which prevails between Great Britain and the United States, it is an object to Great Britain, from a financial standpoint, to manufacture as much of her own requirements as possible on the other side of the Atlantic. She is continuing to order in this country the shells which she specially requires, and my hon. friend is entirely mistaken in his statement that the shell industry of Canada is to be effaced. He had the information in the answer which I gave him, which would have told him that that conclusion was entirely unfounded, as I know he believes, because, instead of the Dominion Government decreasing the amount which we have supplied to the Imperial Government for the production of shells in Canada, we have, during the last two or three months, greatly increased that amount. I pointed out to my hon. friend, upon the occasion to which I have referred, that we had been paying $25,000,000 per month to the Imperial treasury for the purpose of paying for munitions in the Dominion of Canada. I may say that in July and August we paid out much more than $25,000,000 each month for that purpose. I may say further that we have arranged, as my hon. friend has stated, to pay the sum of $25,000,000 per month for September, October, November and December for shells, and it is our intention to continue such payments as long as the war lasts. Let us consider for a moment what that means. $25,000,000 per month is easily said, but $25,000,000 per month means $300,000,000 per year. That is equal to two loans of $150,000,000, one every six months

In order that this House may see how the Dominion Government has risen to the occasion so far as supplying funds to the Imperial Government is concerned, I desire to submit just a few figures, promising not to take up too much of the time of the House. In round figures we have supplied the following amounts to the Imperial treasury during this year: January, $20,000,000; February, $25,000,000; March, $34,000,000; April, $25,000,000; May, $26,000,000; June, $36,000,000; July, $48,000,000; August, $37,000,000; and the estimate for the month of September is $40,000,000. Not only is the Dominion Government supplying money to the Imperial treasury for the production of munitions in Canada, but it is by reason of the action of the Dominion treasury in financing the Imperial treasury that the dairymen of Canada today are able to sell their cheese to the British Cheese Commission. For many years the cheese industry of Canada has been built up by reason of the export market which existed in Great Britain. If the Dominion Government had not undertaken to supply the $40,000,000 which represents the value of Canada's export cheese, the dairy farmers of this country would not today be able to sell their cheese in Great Britain, and there is no market to-day for that cheese in the United States. The dairy farmers of Canada, by reason of the action of the Dominion Government in furnishing that $40,000,000, are deriving over 21 cents per pound for their cheese. The Dominion treasury, therefore, since July, has undertaken to furnish $25,000,000 per month and more for munitions, and in addition has undertaken to supply $40,000,000 for the purchase of cheese by the British Cheese Commission in Canada, and some $10,000,000 additional for purchases made for the War Office account by the Department of Agriculture.

Mr. R. B. BENNETT: Have any arrangements been made with relation to the purchase of wheat?

Sir THOMAS WHITE: No arrangements have been made as to the purchase of wheat. That in the past has always been carried out, as my hon. friend knows, through the chartered banks of Canada.

Mr. OLIVER: Will the minister mention what is the condition in regard to bacon?

Sir THOMAS WHITE: I was coming to that in a moment—I am glad my hon. friend reminded me, although I do not think I would have forgotteen it. At present Canada's bacon is going forward to Great Britain, but it has been drawn to my attention that the British Government may require some assistance in connection with the purchase of Canada's bacon, which means so much, as my hon. friend from Edmonton knows, to the hog industry of Canada. Nobody knows that better than my hon. friend. The only reason I mention these things is that I desire the House to know that the problem is a large one and not confined to munitions. It touches the farmer in his production of cheese, hogs and cattle, so that the financial question is a large one, and the point I desire to draw to the attention of the House is that the Dominion Government has been supplying the Imperial treasury, for the purposes which I have mentioned, with vast sums of money, sums which it would in the period preceding this war have been deemed absolutely impossible for us to supply. I venture to say that no member of this House, and no citizen of this country, would have predicted that it was possible for the Dominion Government to assist the Imperial treasury to the extent that I have indicated since the outbreak of this war.

I desire the House to know in connection with this debate, although it has been placed in Hansard before, the magnitude of the financial operations which the Dominion Government has carried on for the Imperial treasury. It is not sufficient to say that these operations are a set-off to the expenditures made by Great Britain for Canada in respect of our troops overseas. The fact of the matter is that Canada has been able since the beginning of this war not only to pay her own way, but to give Great Britain a sum exceeding $100,000,000 towards the prosecution of the war, through the purchase of munitions and supplies in this country. Since the outbreak of this war the Dominion Government has advanced in cash and securities, which securities were pledged in New York and furnished the basis of an Imperial credit there, no less a sum than $443,000,000.

Mr. PUGSLEY: Would the minister explain the nature of those securities?

Sir THOMAS WHITE: We issued to the Imperial treasury about $112,000,000 of 3½ and 4 per cent securities maturing in 1928 and 1945, in liquidation of advances made by the Imperial Government. The Imperial Government pledged those securities in New York and used them along with other securities as the basis of a large loan which they raised there in the period preceding the entry of the United States into the war.

Mr. PUGSLEY: Does the Imperial Government have to pay interest?

Sir THOMAS WHITE: No, we pay it.

Mr. PUGSLEY: Does not the Imperial Government pay interest to this Government?

Sir THOMAS WHITE: No. We have given them the securities, and we pay the interest because the securities are given.

Mr. PUGSLEY: I wanted to know whether or not the Imperial Government pays interest to Canada upon the advances that Canada makes.

Sir THOMAS WHITE: There is an adjustment of interest on both sides. We charge interest here, and they charge interest there. The point I was making was that Canada has advanced in cash and securities $100,000,000 more to Great Britain than Great Britain has advanced to Canada since the outbreak of this war. So far as the munitions industry is concerned, the Dominion Government is furnishing more money now per month than it has furnished since the war began. I have stated that it is our intention to continue the payments of $25,000,000 per month until the end of the year, and it is our expectation that we shall be able to continue them until the end of the war. Further, the Dominion Government has financed for the Imperial Government the purchase of Canada's export cheese production, which otherwise would not have been able to find a market, and we have been approached and are now considering the question of furnishing credits which will enable the Imperial treasury to buy other foodstuffs in Canada.

This financial question is a large one, and we have met it in a large way. The only objection I have to make, although I do not desire to be controversial, is this: When I was faced in July last with the problem of raising over $100,000,000 with-

in a period of two months to meet the requirements of the Imperial treasury in its purchase of munitions and supplies in this country, and when, in order to do that, I went to New York and faced the interest conditions which I was obliged to face there, and floated a loan of $100,000,000, I was never criticised more severely by the hon. member for Pictou and other hon. gentlemen opposite. That was done in order that the Imperial Government might be supplied with money for the purchase of munitions, cheese and other supplies from this country. In war time you face war conditions, pay war rates of interest, and war rates of commissions. The Dominion Government has used every effort in order to meet the huge financial requirements of the Imperial treasury in making purchases of munitions and other supplies in this country. That has been our policy, and that will be our policy.

4 p.m.

There was no reason why this motion should be put forward, because the munitions industry is not by any means threatened with effacement. The Dominion Government is paying to the Imperial Munitions Board every month more than it has ever paid in preceding months, and we propose to continue the policy which will give to Great Britain the shells which it requires and which can be made in this country. But it must be borne in mind that the Dominion Government and this Parliament have a large family. There is not only the manufacturer of munitions to be considered, but the farmer, with his cheese, and hogs and other foodstuffs. All these things must be considered in connection with the financial programme of the Imperial treasury and the assistance which will be afforded by the Dominion Government.

Mr. W. M. GERMAN (Welland): I have not very much to say on the question now before the House, but it does seem to me that the remarks of the Minister of Finance amply justify the motion of my hon. friend from Pictou. If the only result of this discussion were to clear up the situation and give to the people of this country the information which they desire on this matter, my hon. friend would have been more than justified in making his motion.

I cannot quite appreciate the argument of the Minister of Finance. He has stated that Canada is continually paying out hundreds of millions of dollars to aid the British treasury. But we all know that Great Britain is paying out hundreds of millions of dollars continually for the upkeep of our troops in France and Flanders and Great Britain, and we, therefore, are simply discharging a debt which we owe to Great Britain for the upkeep of our soldiers. The question resolves itself into this: It is stated that the manufacture of munitions in Canada is to be stopped, and that the manufacture of munitions in the United States is to be continued, because the British Government can get munitions in the United States on credit, but cannot get them here on credit, as apparently Canada is not able to finance the munitions industry. Canada up to the present time has done nothing more than meet its obligations to Great Britain for the upkeep of our army in Great Britain and France, and has hardly done that. The minister has not yet explained to the House, on this or any other occasion, whether our munitions factories are to be maintained in the position which they have occupied in the past, and which we hope they will maintain in the future. As was stated at the opening of this discussion by the leader of the Opposition, the munitions factories in Canada are about the only factories that are really profit-earning institutions at the present time. So far as the Niagara district is concerned, in the town of Welland we have four large munitions factories, all of which are on an excellent financial basis. These factories have all expended large sums in extending their plant and putting in new machinery, and up to the present they have not made enormous profits, even though prices have been high.

If the manufacture of munitions is shut off in Canada, these institutions instead of being profit-earning institutions, will practically be operating at a loss. It will be a very great disaster to Canada, not only in that particular section, but all over Canada, if the manufacture of munitions is cut down. As far as I am able to judge, there is no reason why munitions should not be manufactured in Canada as well as in the United States. There is no reason why they should not all be manufactured in Canada instead of any of them being manufactured in the United States, inasmuch as it is a question of the credit that can be given by the Canadian or the United States Governments. Our Government is very expert in preparing legislation for franchise, and voters' lists Acts for winning elections, apparently, but they are not so astute in preparing legislation to protect the industries of this country in this time of strife and trouble. The

minister should have given us very much more information than he has given and he should have assured the people of Canada that the manufacture of munitions would not be curtailed, much less put an end to, and that all the munitions which are to be made on this side of the Atlantic for the British Government would be made in Canada instead of being made in the United States.

Sir GEORGE FOSTER: My hon. friend has twice made the statement that whilst the order has gone forth that the manufacture of munitions for the British army would not be continued in Canada, they are continuing to purchase similar munitions in the United States. Is my hon. friend sure of his ground? My information is absolutely to the contrary.

Mr. GERMAN: The report which goes forth to the country, whether correct or incorrect, is that the British Government will purchase their munitions in the United States and that the manufacture of munitions in Canada, if not wholly done away with, will be curtailed to a practically infinitesimal amount.

Sir GEORGE FOSTER: By taking up that report and taking it as true, if he does not know that it is true, my hon. friend puts behind it the responsibility of a member of Parliament. Perhaps I might go a little farther and say to my hon. friend that if there be any such report as that it is absolutely unfounded.

Mr. GERMAN: The circumstances of the situation do not appear to show that it is unfounded, because the manufacture of munitions in Canada is being very largely curtailed.

Sir GEORGE FOSTER: The manufacture of similar munitions for the British Government in the United States was curtailed months ago. Contracts that were entered into were dissolved and no new contracts have been entered into.

Mr. GERMAN: Whether or not the statement which my right hon. friend makes is correct—and I will not deny that it is correct—we know that the manufacturers of munitions in Canada are being told that they will not have an opportunity of supplying these munitions in the future as in the past, whereas, at the same time, the manufacture of munitions in the United States is being carried on to a very large extent. Whether correct or incorrect, the report is that the British Government will be purchasing more munitions in the United States, because they can get credit there and they cannot get credit in Canada.

If that report is incorrect, then this discussion is well brought before us to-day, because it will be a very excellent opportunity for the Government to explain the whole situation, that the people may know just where they stand and what is likely to happen. We cannot afford to allow the industries which since the war broke out have been really the back-bone of this country, to be cut down or curtailed, if it is at all possible to maintain them by any action of this Government in supplying larger credits to Great Britain. That is the whole question. If we can provide the credit up to the extent that munitions can be supplied in Canada as well as they are being supplied in the United States, then our industries will get the benefit. It behooves the Government at this time to take great care that our financial situation is such that we can maintain a credit here which will result in the maintenance of those industries which have been in existence during these years, and which we hope will continue during the remainder of the war.

Mr. G. W. KYTE, (Richmond): I desire to say a word or two upon this subject, because a very considerable—

Some hon. MEMBERS: Oh, Oh.

Mr. KYTE: I am sorry to see that some of my hon. friends on the other side are like the Minister of Trade and Commerce in not considering this a very important question.

An hon. MEMBER: You do not, either.

Mr. KYTE: It is a very important question. A large proportion of the population in eastern Nova Scotia has been engaged in the manufacture of munitions during the last three years. I might recall to the House the condition of affairs which existed as regards unemployment in Canada previous to the outbreak of the war. We know that in the large cities, from 1912 to 1914 there was a very severe condition of unemployment. We also know that in the city of Ottawa, in the very shadow of the Parliament Buildings, a procession of 500 unemployed men walked to the City Hall and demanded that provision be made by the city for the support and maintenance of their families, as a result of their inability to secure remunerative work. At

the outbreak of the war large industries were established which relieved to a very great extent the situation. Recently notice has been given by certain manufacturers of munitions, in eastern Canada particularly, that the contracts are to be discontinued hereafter, and a great deal of unemployment has resulted. In the town of New Glasgow, for instance, two thousand men were thrown out of employment without a moment's notice. Naturally they are concerned in knowing what is to be provided as a substitute for the employment which had heretofore given them a livelihood and which is no longer available. The Minister of Finance referred to the unfavourable condition of exchange, which he said made it impossible for the British Government to place any further contracts with the manufacturers of munitions in Canada. We know that some months ago the Right Hon. A. J. Balfour and others associated with him came to the United States as a commission, to go into the question of the placing of contracts with the United States Government in respect of war munitions. We are also aware of the fact that the hon. the Minister of Trade and Commerce (Sir George Foster) visited Washington at that time, and it was presumed he was more especially the representative of the Canadian Government.

Sir GEORGE FOSTER: Will my hon. friend allow me? Did I understand him to say that Mr. Balfour came to the United States for the purpose of making contracts with the United States for war munitions?

Mr. KYTE: No, he came for the purpose of discussing with the United States certain matters of interest on behalf of the Imperial Government, which had relation to financial questions in regard to the carrying out of war contracts.

Sir GEORGE FOSTER: That is a very different thing.

Mr. KYTE: The Minister of Trade and Commerce visited Washington at that time, and while we have had no official information on the subject so far as I am aware, I presume his object is to associate himself, as the special representative of the Government of Canada, with the Right Hon. Mr. Balfour. With regard to the question of finances, I have only to say this: For the last four or five days we have been engaged in discussing certain estimates which have been submitted to Parliament. It was pointed out on several occasions by hon. members on this side of the House, that at this particular time when the question of finances so largely entered into the carrying on of our obligations in respect of munitions as well as other contributions to the British Government, it would be well for the Finance Minister to pare down these estimates and reduce the expenditures as much as possible. We have had estimates totalling $254,000,000, of which some $50,000,000 odd were supplementary estimates, placed before Parliament at this session. If there is any question as regards the subject of exchange or the difficulty of supplying money for the purpose of carrying out these contracts, I really think the Finance Minister would have acted very much more wisely if he had provided against that emergency and stricken from those estimates a very large amount which could very properly be classed as unnecessary expenditure. For instance, there was an item of some $269,000 for telephones in British Columbia, as well as many other items to which reference might be made. The fact is the Government appears to be as helpless in respect of meeting this situation as they are in every other situation which has been presented to them. I think it is the duty of the Government to make some effort to provide employment for the working people of Canada to replace the employment which has ceased in respect of the manufacture of munitions. There is great necessity for shipbuilding in Canada, particularly in eastern Canada. This industry would provide employment for a great number of men. It is impossible for the Government under present conditions to continue the manufacture of munitions, I feel it would be desirable for them to open up some other means of employment, so as to relieve the very serious condition which is likely to result during the coming months.

Mr. PUGSLEY (St. John, N.B.): I wish to say a few words upon this subject, because it is one which is not only of very general interest but is of especial interest to the constituency I represent, as we have two large munition factories in St. John. I am sure that any sudden stoppage of the manufacture of munitions would result in very great hardship in a large number of cases, not only from a financial standpoint but to many workpeople who would be thrown out of employment. I have in mind one factory which was recently erected more especially for the manufacture of shells in which, I

believe, about $750,000 to $1,000,000 is invested. I am sure that factory was erected with the confident expectation that the manufacture of shells in Canada would be continued upon the same scale as previously until the close of the war, or until some decisive victory at all events, had been won. I would not for a moment attempt to disparage what this Government has done towards assisting Great Britain in connection with the purchase of war supplies. I think the Government has done well. At the same time it must not be forgotten that were it not for the wonderful response the people of Canada made to the requirements of the Government nothing could have been accomplished. While my hon. friend takes great credit to the Government and to the Minister of Finance——

Sir THOMAS WHITE: I give all the credit to the people.

Mr. PUGSLEY—he must not forget that Canada has willingly and cheerfully responded to the demands made since the opening of the war. I hope my hon. friend will give all the credit to the people, because it is the people who have been paying out these enormous sums of money which have enabled the Government to give such assistance to the Empire. But, Mr. Speaker, would it not occur to you that the very fact that Canada has done so well and that she has been able to finance so largely for Great Britain is the very best possible reason why the Government should insist upon the manufacture of shells being continued in Canada? My hon. friend has given the very best of reasons why the manufacture of shells should not cease. I think the minister ought to have informed the House—because I think the country has a right to know—what report has been made to the British Government as a result of the notices which have gone out that the production of shells is to be lessened if not discontinued in Canada. Indeed, we know that the manufacture of some descriptions of shells is to be entirely discontinued. Let me refer for a moment to the letter from the chairman of the Imperial Munitions Board, which my hon. friend read to the House. It will bear reading again, because it shows a state of affairs which, I think, is deserving of the most earnest consideration of the Government. The letter reads:

Ottawa, 21st August, 1917.

Towards the close of 1916 the capacity for producing munitions in Great Britain had so increased that the Minister of Munitions advised that it was not necessary to continue the production of munitions in the United States for British account, except for a few special lines. The production in Canada, however, was continued as before.

The minister has now advised that it is unnecessary to continue production in Canada on the present scale. He has directed that certain lines shall be discontinued; that other lines shall be produced in lessened quantities; while some lines are to be continued as at present.

If language means what it says, the people of Canada must clearly understand that the manufacture of certain lines of shells is to be discontinued. If the intention of the British Government is as expressed in the letter of the chairman of the Munitions Board, it must mean a very great decrease in production, and must mean turning thousands of people in Canada, men and women, out of employment, which will produce a condition of distress in this country during the coming winter. Is not that a subject which ought to engage the attention of this Government? Is not that a matter on which representations should have been made by this Government to the British Government? There is no statement—and it is inconceivable that there would be a statement—that the British Government do not want munitions. The explanation is, either that Great Britain intends to continue upon the same extensive scale, or to engage upon a larger scale than heretofore, the manufacture of munitions in England, or that she is going to obtain munitions upon a larger scale from the United States. The time has not arrived when the demand for munitions at the front is any less than it has been in the past. Surely the Minister of Finance should give the House some explanation in regard to the matter, some reason why the British Government is determined to reduce the manufacture of munitions in this country. The question surely is of sufficient importance to warrant correspondence between the Canadian and Imperial Governments. And yet upon that question the minister gives us no explanation. He apparently is content to allow the closing of the factories in Canada, and the throwing of thousands of people out of employment, without endeavouring to ascertain the cause, and without endeavouring to give any information to the people of Canada on this important subject. The minister says that Canada has financed Great Britain to such a degree that Great Britain is owing to this country at least one hundred millions more than Canada owes the Mother Country in connection with the prosecution of the war. If that is

the case, does it not show what a splendid part Canada has taken in this war of the Empire, and that our people are entitled to the utmost consideration? Does it not show the strongest possible reason why, so far as possible, the manufacture of munitions should be continued in Canada? I think that this House and the people should be informed as to what effort the Dominion Government has made to induce the British Government adequately, so far as the manufacture of munitions and purchase of supplies is concerned, to recognize the splendid efforts which Canada has put forward, not only in finance but in sending troops to the front. Canada has done her part, and, so far as financing is concerned, has done more than her part; and I repeat that instead of there being any reason why this extraordinary order should have been given out by the chairman of the Munitions Board, there are the strongest possible reasons why the manufacture of munitions should continue on as large, if not larger, scale than in the past. I wish to emphasize the position taken by myself and other members of this House since the manufacture of shells in Canada began, that the work should have been undertaken by the Government as a government work. Shells should have been manufactured under the direction of the Government, and should have been supplied at actual cost. Reasonable wages should have been paid to the workmen engaged in the manufacture, but no such large profits should have been given as have been given to the manufacturers of munitions. We know—because the facts cannot be controverted—that early in this war, and in the early stages of the manufacture of shells, upwards of one hundred million dollars was wasted by the Shell Committee appointed by this Government under the direction of the late Minister of Militia. If good fair business methods had been adopted that amount of money could have been saved to the country and the Empire, and it would have represented, and represents to-day, all the surplus which the Minister of Finance (Sir Thomas White) boastingly says this Government has provided for the Imperial Government. Up to that period this enormous sum of money was wasted, and we have every reason to believe that, even since the Imperial Munitions Board has taken charge, very large profits have gone to manufacturers which might have been saved if the Government had undertaken the production of shells as a Government work, and with a determination to supply the shells and other munitions of war to the Allies at actual cost, instead of having the work carried on by private parties, in many cases at enormous profit.

In conclusion, I desire to ask the Government to inform the House whether or not they have, as a Government, taken up this communication from the Chairman of the Imperial Munitions Board; whether they have communicated with the British Government and endeavoured to ascertain the reason why this notice has been sent out, and why it is proposed to discontinue, or greatly reduce, the manufacture of shells in Canada? If the Government has any information on the subject; if any correspondence has taken place between the two Governments, that information should be placed before the House in order that Parliament and the country may be fully informed in the matter.

Sir GEORGE FOSTER: I do not wish to prolong the debate, but it seems to me to be necessary to make a few comments upon the discussion which has taken place. I wish to point out the peculiarity of the position that some hon. gentlemen on the other side have taken and the inconsistency of that position as compared with that heretofore taken by them. I shall refer only to the chief of these inconsistencies; my remarks will be brief.

The member for Pictou (Mr. Macdonald) suddenly becomes a champion of the munition industry in this country. He asks questions as to what has taken place, what will take place, and why. He says: why should the shell industry be stopped; should we not assist in the war by going on with the shell industry to the same extent that it has hitherto been proceeded with in Canada? He was brim full of enthusiasm, energy, vigour, insistence, when he urged that we must do our part in assisting in the war by making shells. I thought to myself that if he had only shown the same insistency, the same vigour, the same strength in an effort to assist in some other way in the prosecution of the war, he would be further ahead and this country would be further ahead than at present. Does my hon. friend not see that in this new born zeal for the munition industry he and his friends are becoming the champions of what they have hitherto denounced as a profiteering industry? He made a most plaintive appeal to the Minister of Finance to keep up the munitions business in order that profits might be obtained therefrom and in order that the minister might get from

that source a portion of the necessary revenue. If ever there was an example of a man straining at a gnat and swallowing a camel, the member for Pictou was such an example this afternoon—and I never knew him to strain more strenuously or swallow more successfully.

Is the munitions industry, my hon. friend says, to become extinct in this country? If he wants a straight answer to that question, I say, yes: I hope it is to become extinct; I hope that it will become extinct very quickly by the conclusion of this monstrous war which has made the manufacture of munitions in Canada necessary for so long a period. Can we contemplate the end of the war and yet make the demand that the same explosives shall be manufactured, the same munitions ordered, the same tremendous expense incurred as hitherto? These are the engines of war; they are destructive from A to Z, and when they cease because war ceases, a feeling of relief will be experienced in all parts of the world. The argument of the member for Pictou was that you must keep the war going for the sake of keeping up the manufacture of munitions in Canada, and of employing labour and capital and securing profits. Is Canada, the member for Pictou says, to have her hands tied in the manufacture of munitions? Why, he asks, should capital invested in the manufacture of munitions be struck down? Again I press my point against my hon. friend's argument. It is a vicious argument which, pressed to its logical conclusion, is nothing more or less than this: Do not restrict the output of munitions; do not strike down capital; do not restrain wages; keep up the war in order to keep all those things going. No other logical conclusion can be drawn from his argument.

I now come to the argument of the member for St. John (Mr. Pugsley). He, too, is deeply interested in the keeping up of the manufacture of munitions at the old rate in Canada. He, however, falls foul of the chief reasons given by the member for Pictou for his contentions. He (Mr. Pugsley) says that if he had his way he would have these manufactures of munitions so carried out by the Government that there would be no profits. Therefore the argument of the member for Pictou, as to keeping up the manufacture of munitions so that revenue may be obtained from the profits, falls to the ground. The two hon. gentlemen are not in agreement.

In all frankness and candour, what does the member for St. John mean? What does he argue for? What does he insist upon?

He says that Great Britain should continue to buy munitions in Canada and we to manufacture them. Let me once more revert to his intimation that while the manufacture of munitions is being restricted to a certain extent in Canada, shells are being purchased by Great Britain in the United States. This is absolutely not the fact. I have stated that before, there is no need of my reiterating it; I gave the information to the member for Welland (Mr. German). But here is the important thing: Why, the hon. gentleman asks, does Great Britain restrict or discontinue the manufacture of munitions in Canada? A straight answer to that is this: Because she is now able to supply in her own country all that she needs. Does my hon. friend argue that if Great Britain needs numberless and tremendously expensive supplies, she shall continue to obtain outside of her own territory what she can make to excess within her own borders? That is exactly what my hon. friend's argument amounts to. To demand that is to make a vicious demand, one not in the interests of Canada or of the Empire; one not in the interests of the war or of the conclusion of peace.

Does my hon. friend seriously argue that, because we in Canada would get wages and find employment by Great Britain coming here for munitions in excess of what she can make in her own country, therefore we ought selfishly to ask her to make that sacrifice and she ought to make that sacrifice in order that we might have that employment and those wages? Canada does not take that position. I am willing to leave that position to my hon. friend from St. John. There are things that Great Britain cannot produce in her own country and that we can produce in Canada, and there is peril to-day that Great Britain, owing to her financial position, will not be able to purchase from Canada what she absolutely needs of the beneficent production of this country. Yet my hon. friend from St. John would have this Government insist upon the British Government spending hundreds of millions of dollars in this country for munitions which can be made in Britain, to the detriment of the purchase in this country of the agricultural products which we can raise and which Great Britain cannot raise. There is no ground for such an argument as that or for insisting upon it. So far as this Government is concerned, we do not intend to insist upon that thing being done. We do not intend to take the vicious ground of demanding that Great

Britain shall spend her millions in Canada getting made here what she can better and more cheaply make in Great Britain for the prosecution of the war, and thereby leave herself without funds to buy what is absolutely necessary, food for the British people, from Canada, which can and does raise that food and wishes to supply it. If this Government is going to urge the British Government to purchase anything in this country, it will be not munitions, but the fruits of the earth, the products of the soil, the farmer's increment, which Great Britain cannot supply and which we can supply in abundance. I leave my hon. friend from St. John to his argument that this Government shall make a plea to the Government of Great Britain that Great Britain shall continue to make her expenditures in this country in such a way that we may carry on the manufacture of munitions to the same extent as before. Great Britain has bought munitions in Canada to a tremendous extent. During the last two years and a half she has expended nearly $400,000,000 on munitions in this country. perhaps more than that, I have not the exact figures. She has done that because she has needed those things, because she was not then fully equipped for making them, and also because we financed the purchases for her. But as soon as she became thoroughly equipped to make all those munitions that she needed and has a surplus from which to supply her Allies, was it not wise and right that she should give that work to her own people, keep that money in her own country, and thereby more economically and cheaply throw her resources into the field for the successful prosecution of the war?

My colleague the Minister of Finance has very frankly laid before this House some phases of the financial question, about which we probably do not think as much as we might and which it is very difficult for us adequately to sense. It may very well be thought that Great Britain is the richest country in the world; that she has interminable resources. To a certain extent it is true that she is rich and has great resources; but the financial burdens imposed upon Great Britain from the beginning of the war are also beyond the power of the human mind to grasp. She has upon her shoulders the financial burden of maintaining the greatest fleet in the world, a fleet now almost double what it was at the beginning of the war. Instead of an army of 150,000 men which she had trained when the war began, she is maintaining an army of well up to four or five millions of men which she is maintaining. She carries on operations in every continent and in almost every quarter of the globe. She has her military expeditions in South Africa, Asia, Italy, the Balkans, Mesopotamia and at the front in France. She has contingents of her forces everywhere. She shoulders that whole work. Her Allies, France, Italy, Russia, Belgium and the Balkan States have depended upon Great Britain, and generously she has given them the support without which they could not have done what they have done. All that comes upon Great Britain and any one who will carefully think that over and try to realize what it means will come to the conclusion that there are not immeasurable depths of resources in Great Britain. To make a long story short, Great Britain to-day finds the very greatest difficulty in financing her needs and the needs of the war. Canada has stood behind her as no other outside dominions has done or has been able to do, not that others have not had as good a will, but they have not had the resources and therefore, they have not been able to do as much as Canada has done. But Canada has tried to do her share in that respect. Why do hon. gentlemen opposite continually minimize and scout at what Canada has done in this war? I am willing to make this proposition. If you will put before a committee of the first men of the world, versed in these affairs, Canada's effort and what she has done in these three years of war, their verdict would be that it was simply astounding that a country, with a population of 7,000,000, had done what Canada has done during this great and terrible struggle. But to hear some hon. gentlemen speak, one would think that Canada had done nothing; that she was absolutely useless in this whole war, wholly without effort, vigour, capacity or efficiency. Do not let us, for the sake of a personal or party advantage, disparage altogether the work, worth and effort—of the Government, do you say?—no, but of the people of Canada who alone have enabled the Government to do what they have done.

So the matter of financing for the future is a very difficult problem. Here was your cheese industry in Canada running up to $40,000,000, or $50,000,000, or $60,000,000. Britain was not able to finance for that cheese. So Canada came in and financed for it, and is doing it to this day. There is also your bacon and hog industry, and the live stock industry. Great Britain needed that chesse, but Great

Britain is not able to-day to finance for what she absolutely needs from this country in the way of these products, and if it is to be done Canada must do it. Canada is prepared to do it to the utmost of her power—is doing it to-day and is organizing to do it in the future. Yonder in the West is a possible wheat crop with a surplus of anywhere between 100,000,000 and 200,000,000 bushels. If Great Britain does not buy that wheat, who will? If Great Britain does buy that wheat Great Britain must finance, and perhaps very largely through Canada herself. And yet here are gentlemen who plead with tears in their voices that we should keep up the munitions factories, and let our wheat lie in the elevators or on the prairies of the West. My right hon. friend the leader of the Opposition (Sir Wilfrid Laurier) smiles. Well, a smile often betokens—but I will not characterize it. I say that no man who knows the facts of the whole financial situation so far as Canada is concerned, and its bearing upon this war, will smile when a minister makes the statements I have made here to-day. They are statements of the utmost gravity, which must sink into the hearts of the Canadian people, and which one day will make them feel very differently towards this matter than they do even at the present time. I am sorry I have been led into making these extended remarks. I do not pretend to convince these gentlemen.

Mr. PUGSLEY: You omitted the Canadian Northern obligations.

Mr. LEMIEUX: And the Quebec and Saguenay railway.

Sir GEORGE FOSTER: I did that very largely out of sympathy—

Mr. PUGSLEY: Not forgetfulness.

Sir GEORGE FOSTER: —with my hon. friends opposite. Yet they occupy the fortunate position of having led this country into a cul de sac, and then sit back and laugh at those who must make their way out.

Mr. OLIVER: Whatever question there might have been in the mind of any one in the House as to the importance of the discussion precipitated by the hon. member for Pictou, there can be no question whatever as to its importance now, after the speech of the Minister of Trade and Commerce. The question of the ability of the British Empire to finance this war is surely big enough to engross the attention of the Canadian Parliament for an hour or two, and if that is properly a part of this discussion, then surely this discussion is more than justified. Even the Canadian Parliament can afford to take a little time in discussing a matter of such stupendous importance and interest. But, as a matter of fact, what the Canadian Parliament is here for is to take care of the finances of Canada, and of the business and industry of Canada; to take care that Canada does not lose her place in the race of progress, whether there is war or whether there is peace. And if the burden is all the greater when war is on, that only means that the Government and Parliament of Canada are charged with greater responsibility now than when peace prevails. Their business is to see that the best is done that can be done on behalf of Canada in her war operations, and in those peace operations which must necessarily succeed, if war is to be successfully maintained. Our efforts in active warfare are absolutely dependent upon our conditions of industry and production and taxpaying power at home, and the member of the Government who presumes to lead the consideration of Parliament away from that patent fact in describing the glories and the responsibilities of the British Empire is simply trying to avoid the question at issue.

5 p.m.

The question at issue is a very simple one. A great industry in Canada is being shut down in part. The hon. member for Pictou has stated that several hundreds, if not thousands, of his constituents have been thrown out of employment in the last few weeks, as a result of authority issued by the Imperial Munitions Board. That, I submit, is a matter of most supreme importance to the hon. member for Pictou, and if it is an indication of what is to take place throughout the Dominion, it is a matter of supreme importance to this Parliament and is entitled to the very best consideration that Parliament can give it. The country, I submit, is entitled to the very fullest information that can be given on this question—entitled to something entirely different from the broad generalizations, the glittering generalities that have been handed out to the House and the country by the two ministers who have already spoken.

It is a fact that several munitions plants in Canada have been shut down, and it is a fact that the announcement from the Imperial Munitions Board is to the effect that

we must expect further shutting down of munitions plants in Canada. Now, whether or not we on this side of the House have spoken disparagingly of the men who have been carrying on these munitions enterprises because of the vast and unreasonable profit they have been permitted to make, has nothing whatever to do with the question of the investment of legitimate capital or the employment of legitimate industry in the conduct of those enterprises. We are entitled to pay heed to the question whether the enormous flow of money that has kept these industries in Canada going during the past year or two is to be stopped or whether it is to continue. If I gathered correctly what my hon. friend the Minister of Finance (Sir Thomas White) said, that flow of money is going to stop.

Sir THOMAS WHITE: What made my hon. friend think that?

Mr. OLIVER: I beg my hon. friend's pardon, I meant the Minister of Trade and Commerce (Sir George Foster).

Sir THOMAS WHITE: I made the express statement that we were paying now more per month than we had ever done in the past, and that we had arranged to pay $25,000,000 a month to the Imperial treasury for munitions during October, November and December, and hoped to continue during the war.

Mr. OLIVER: That being the case, the question of financing does not enter into the matter of the withdrawal of the orders for munitions.

Sir THOMAS WHITE: It does enter into it.

Mr. OLIVER: I gather from the remarks of the Minister of Trade and Commerce that the withdrawal of munitions orders from Canada had much to do with the question of finance—British finance and Canadian finance.

Sir THOMAS WHITE: For larger amount, yes.

Mr. OLIVER: I am unable to correlate the arguments of my two hon. friends. I am to understand that we have the statement of the Minister of Finance that the orders are not being withdrawn because of any failure to finance on the part of Canada?

Mr. THOMAS WHITE: The statement I made was that we are continuing the payments which we have made monthly and that they have even been increased during July, August and September. But the point I was making when I interrupted my hon. friend was that if you had a fifty-million-a-month situation and Great Britain had to consider the purchase not only of munitions but of cheese, hogs and wheat, of course, there would be financial considerations entering into it.

Mr. OLIVER: As Great Britain has to purchase wheat, cheese and bacon as well as munitions—

Sir THOMAS WHITE: Where would she get the money?

Mr. OLIVER: I say that as she has to purchase wheat, cheese and bacon as well the question of finance does enter into it.

Sir THOMAS WHITE: It does enter into it in regard to all her purchases, of course.

Mr. OLIVER: I gathered from what the Minister of Trade and Commerce said that owing to the tremendous burden carried by the British Empire because of the war her financial resources were becoming diminished to such an extent that her purchases in Canada depended upon the ability of the Canadian Government to finance these purchases.

Sir THOMAS WHITE: To a certain extent.

Mr. OLIVER: I understood the Minister of Trade and Commerce to make that statement. If I am not right in that I wish to be corrected because all I want to get out of this discussion is the facts of the case. These facts are pressing; they are important. I desire in a moment to say something on another matter which comes very much more closely home to my part of the country. But as far as munitions are concerned it all rests upon the point that the business done by the British Government in Canada depends on the ability of Canada to finance that business.

Sir THOMAS WHITE: Partly.

Mr. OLIVER: If it does, and if this business is being withdrawn from Canada, it is not because the munitions are not needed. Munitions are needed as much as they ever were and as far as I can see there is no reasonable prospect that they will not be needed for an indefinite period. The British Government must get munitions from somewhere and they must get food from somewhere. The financial condition being as it is, if Canada cannot finance the British Government for the food and munitions required from Canada, then Canada cannot

supply that food and those munitions. I understood the Minister of Trade and Commerce to intimate that the British Government was now able to produce all the munitions it required within its own territory. I am afraid my right hon. friend will have to admit that that is not correct. The British Government is purchasing munitions very largely in the United States at the present time.

Sir GEORGE FOSTER: It will depend, as my hon. friend knows, on the definition of "munitions." We are discussing the munitions supplied in Canada for the British Government. There are types and varieties. Of those types and varieties Great Britain is not purchasing in other countries but there are other munitions of war which Canada cannot supply, which Great Britain cannot supply to the extent needed, and which she does get from other countries, notably from the United States. But our argument here is in reference to munitions of the types and varieties that have been made in this country. That is plain ground upon which we can approach the discussion of the question.

Mr. OLIVER: Precisely. We want to know what the facts are. It narrows down to this: Given Canadian ability to finance the purchase of munitions in Canada and given adaptability on the part of the Canadian manufacturers to produce the kind of munitions the British Government requires and to adapt their present plants and facilities to the production of these munitions, there is no necessity for the shutting down of these munition factories in Canada. If that is the fact, I submit it is up to the Government to see that Canada does finance the British Government to the extent of the purchases of these munitions, and it is up to the manufacturers of Canada to make such alterations in their plants as would enable them to supply the kinds of munitions that the British Government want.

Sir GEORGE FOSTER: I want to put this consideration to my honourable friend. If Great Britain is so situated that by keeping her own capital within her own borders and by employing her own people in her own industries, she can make all that is necessary, and more, of these munitions for the conduct of the war, is it economically a good thing to come to Canada, have these made here and distribute the money from her own country for that purpose in the present condition of the world's finances?

[Mr. Oliver.]

Or is it better that as she is in a position to make more than is necessary of those kinds of munitions required for the war, she should conserve her financial resources, and ours in co-operation with her, for the supply to her of what is absolutely necessary but what she cannot supply and of which Canada produces a surplus? I think there is an argument that my hon. friend will be inclined to take up.

Mr. OLIVER: I would be quite willing to accept it if that were the position, but it does not happen to be the position. The British Government, as I understand it, is buying a large quantity of munitions from the United States. My right hon. friend has admitted that, but he says they are of a different class from those manufactured by Canada. Well, then it is up to us to manufacture in Canada what the British Government wants.

Sir GEORGE FOSTER: If my hon. friend takes that position, will he go to the practical men in steel, in iron and other industries and ask them whether they are prepared to put capital into their establishments and machinery necessary to equip these establishments to make the kind of munitions of war which are being made in the United States and which Great Britain gets there—great guns and that kind of machinery? My hon. friend would find that there is no shadow of a chance of initiating such industries as these in Canada at this time.

Mr. OLIVER: I think there is every chance, if we have an enterprising and capable lot of people engaged in the manufacture of munitions. They were able, in the earlier stages of the war, to change from the manufacture of one kind of shell to another, which they did, and if they made that change I do not see why they could not make still another if it were necessary to keep the business in this country so that we would get the benefit of it. My right hon. friend must know from the reports in the press that many of the men who have been discharged from the closed-down munition factories in Canada have gone across the line and are making munitions in the munition plants in the United States, and, I presume, making the same identical class of munitions.

Sir GEORGE FOSTER: If my hon. friend will allow me to get at the facts of the case. He knows, too, that within six months the United States has embarked in the great war, and she is equipping two

million men to go to the front, and is spending billions of dollars to fit out those men with just this kind of material, and there never was, and probably never will be, such a scene of activity as is in the United States now—which will probably continue for the next two years—in the manufacture of equipment of war. If men do not find employment here they can go over there and find employment in the very same kind of work where they are multiplying their establishments by millions and billions of dollars for these purposes.

Mr. OLIVER: That explains how the men are able to get work on the other side, but it does not fill the vacuum in our business enterprises in this country.

Sir THOMAS WHITE: Will my hon. friend allow me to ask him a question? Does he suggest that the Dominion Government could raise more money than it has raised for Imperial purposes, on the figures I gave? And, another question: if Canada is raising the money it can raise for Imperial purposes, and the Imperial Government requires munitions and foodstuffs, are foodstuffs to be put altogether to one side and munitions only regarded?

Mr. OLIVER: No. I do not know whether Canada has been raising to the limit of what she could raise.

Sir THOMAS WHITE: My hon. friend knows the figures well.

Mr. OLIVER: I do not know whether she has been raising up to the limit of her possibilities in support of the carrying on of this war. Let me suggest this. My hon. friend speaks of Canada financing the British Government in the purchase of munitions and foodstuffs in the past. Canada has not been doing anything of the kind.

Sir THOMAS WHITE: She has been raising the money here.

Mr. OLIVER: My hon. friend spoke of a balance of about $100,000,000—

Sir THOMAS WHITE: We raised the money here.

Mr. OLIVER: But we would have had to raise the money to maintain our troops in the Old Country, if we had not had that arrangement with the British Government. It was just as much to our advantage as it was to the advantage of the British Government.

Sir THOMAS WHITE: But, the money has been raised.

Mr. OLIVER: That is true. Let us take credit for doing what we have done in the financing of our part in the war, but let us not take credit for financing the Government of Great Britain, when we are not doing it.

Sir THOMAS WHITE: Let me ask my hon. friend another question. No matter for what purpose it is, could more money have properly been raised than has been raised according to my statement, having regard to the conditions in this country?

Mr. OLIVER: I am not able to answer that. I am not in touch with the finances of Canada, as my hon. friend is. If he says we have raised up to the limit of what was possible, I am quite willing to take his word for it, and I am compelled then to accept the situation as it is, namely, that instead of our Canadian Government being able to finance the British Government in its purchases in Canada, we have only been able to maintain our forces in the field, plus $100,000,000 which we have advanced to Britain. That is the statement of the case. All I ask is that we should know where we stand, and that we should not claim credit for doing something that we are not doing. We are not financing the British Empire any more than we are winning this war. We are doing our part, I hope, loyally and truly. If we are doing the best we possibly can do, that is all we ask of the Government. But, we contend, when they are merely paying on this side of the water money they owe on the other side, they have no right to say they are financing the Government of Great Britain in carrying on the war. Our munitions plants are being shut down because of the financial exigencies of the British Government, which exigencies we in this Dominion are not now able to meet. That is as I gather the situation from what has been said.

Sir THOMAS WHITE: I do not agree with that at all.

Mr. OLIVER: I cannot make anything else out of it. If that is the case in regard to munitions, I wish to draw attention to the fact that the same condition exists in regard to the supplying of bacon. So far as I have been able to gather from the press, the price of hogs fell two cents a pound on the announcement that the British Government would not buy any more

bacon in Canada. Two cents a pound is a very serious matter to the producers of hogs in Canada, and it is a matter of sufficient importance to claim the consideration of this Parliament and of this Government. If it is a fact that the price of hogs has fallen two cents a pound because of the inability of this Government to finance the purchases by Great Britain in Canada, it is a serious situation, and the people of Canada should understand it. They should know why it is so. If it can be avoided, it should be avoided. If it cannot be avoided the public should understand it thoroughly. Let us know exactly where we are.

Sir THOMAS WHITE: Let me interrupt my hon. friend. The regulation in Great Britain to which he refers has not yet become effectual against Canadian bacon, which is still going forward. The drop in the price of hogs had no relation to immediate financing. The question may arise in the future, but it does not arise immediately.

Mr. OLIVER: There is no doubt of the fact that the announcement and the drop in price absolutely synchronized, my hon. friend will admit that; and I am prepared to believe there was an absolute and direct connection between the two events.

Sir THOMAS WHITE: What about the Chicago price and the Buffalo price?

Mr. OLIVER: I am not able to answer that question. I am not familiar with those prices. I am prepared also to believe that, although my hon. friend is able at the moment and for several months to come to finance in regard to munitions, it is understood that he will not be able to continue to do so, and therefore munitions plants are going out of business in expectation of the time when that condition will arise. As I understand it, the position in regard to bacon is that from this time forward the demands of Great Britain for bacon will be filled by the United States, and our Canadian hogs will find their market in the United States instead of going directly to Great Britain, and the profit in the handling will go to the United States instead of remaining in Canada.

Sir THOMAS WHITE: Not if we can finance it, and we shall certainly endeavour to do so.

Mr. OLIVER: If we can finance it, that will not occur; but if we cannot, it is bound to happen. This is a serious matter

[Mr. Oliver.]

to the people of Canada, and it is something they should not be deceived about. They should not have any misunderstanding about it. They should know what their position is in regard to these questions. The conclusion of what I desire to say is, that since the war began we have not been in an absolutely sane condition in regard to matters of finance in the Dominion of Canada. It has been necessary to incur obligations, as the members of the Government have said, undreamed of at any previous time, obligations never contemplated and which possibly would never have been undertaken under any other circumstances. We have become accustomed in this House to voting money not by the millions, or tens of millions, but by the hundreds of millions, and all under the inspiration of the needs of the war.

As long as it only meant the voting of the money, and as long as it meant the expenditure of the money in Canada, with high prices for munitions, munitions plants running night and day, enormous wages to employees, high prices for farm produce, and everything going splendidly, it was only a matter of voting more and more millions. But it is perfectly clear, from what has been said here to-day, that a condition has been reached when this performance cannot go on. We have come to a crisis in our national affairs. My hon. friend said that the British Empire had come to a crisis in its Imperial affairs connected with this war. We, in Canada, have come to a crisis in our national affairs, and we cannot continue the expenditures that we have hitherto been making. It is not possible. Our credit, so far as I can see, is becoming exhausted, and we have the evidence of that in the shutting down of the munitions plant, and the purchase of bacon through the United States. We have changed our financial position within the last few months, and the people of Canada should know it. The Government should take the people into their confidence in regard to this matter, so that we would know exactly where we were. At this time, and under these circumstances, I want to hold the Government of Canada, the gentlemen who sit on the treasury benches, and above every one else the Minister of Finance responsible for the fact that we are in this position at the present time. Since my hon. friend took office, and since this war broke out, there has been no brake placed upon the expenditure of the Dominion of Canada. The same idea of extravagance that prevailed in the purchase of war

supplies has prevailed in the conduct of all government affairs from the day our friends opposite took office. The civil government of Canada costs millions and tens of millions more to-day than it did before they took office, and they have less business to transact in every line relating to civil government.

Sir THOMAS WHITE: That is not correct.

Mr. OLIVER: The books will show.

Sir THOMAS WHITE: Yes, they will show.

Mr. OLIVER: The Government failed to recognize those tremendous obligations that we were assuming on our entry into the war, that we must assume when we enter the war if we are going to do ourselves credit. If we are going to support the Allies with the sacrifice of men, we are surely going to support them with the sacrifice of money, and it was our business to see that every resource of the Dominion of Canada was husbanded to the last cent in order that Canada might play her part in the war, in finance, as well as in men. But it has been as though no such thing occurred. It has been as though a river of wealth were running by, and it was just a matter of how much we could dip out and scatter. The financing of Canada has been conducted on these principles, and, instead of the condition changing for the better from day to day or from year to year, never before in the history of Canada has Parliament witnessed such tremendous extravagance and such unreasonable action as have occurred during the present session. We are going to win the war by burdening our credit with a possible award of $60,000,000 for absolutely nothing; by taking over obligations running up in the neighbourhood of $600,000,000, interest charges that we will never get out of the earnings of the railroad, that will have to come out of the Canadian treasury, at a time when every atom in us should have been concentrated on the idea of saving money, so that we could bear our proper part in the war. We have thrown our money away, wasted it, and depleted our credit, and to-day we must see our industries shut down, and, the profits of our farmers cut off, because of the extravagance with which our affairs have been conducted and the disregard which has been paid to the maintenance of our credit.

Mr. McKENZIE: The motion which was made by the hon. member for Pictou (Mr. Macdonald) this afternoon deals with a matter of the greatest possible importance, or, at least, of great importance to some parts of Canada. It is important for myself and for the people whom I represent in this House because, directly and indirectly, they are concerned in the employment which the manufacture of shells and the production of steel for the shells afforded to the people. It was important because thousands of men were employed in the production of coal, which is the great power which puts the machinery in motion for the making of steel and whatever enters into the production of shells in this country. I think that if the Government were in possession of the facts which led to the lessening of the production of shells they should have given it to this House long before now. If they could have prevented the condition of things in this country which has thrown thousands of men out of employment, we have a right to ask that they should do so, and that they should endeavour to create a condition that would ensure employment for our men. With winter not very far off, the Government should strive to improve conditions which, from the present outlook, promise to be very distressing. I imagine the Minister of Trade and Commerce, by reason of the department which he represents, would be deeply interested in this question. I admit at once that the manufacture of shells was not, before the war, one of the industries of this country, and not an industry which had much to do with the prosperity of Canada, or one which would naturally call for the ingenuity and wisdom of the Minister of Trade and Commerce. It is, perhaps a phrase of the trade and business in this country upon which he had no training and for which, perhaps, he has no predilections or liking. But it so happens that, in the last three years, it has been a trade in this country, providing a livelihood for thousands of people and has created a condition with which we have to cope.

The cutting off of that industry seriously affects the whole community; it affects those directly as well as those indirectly interested. The Department of Trade and Commerce is particularly concerned with this kind of business, and I was surprised that the Minister of Trade and Commerce, of all members of the Government, should obstruct the giving of information asked for by the member for Pictou and desired so urgently by the whole people. I am surprised that the minister should take such a narrow view of this question. He spoke with a view to shutting us off from the discussion and of denying to the people

an opportunity of hearing what should be said on the subject by the Minister of Finance, who is particularly concerned in supplying one of the sinews of war. The reason given by the minister for his attitude is not a sufficient one for the Government to give to the thousands of workmen who are affected by the conditions referred to by the member for Pictou; it is not a sufficient reason to give to thousands of families, the heads of which are unable to find the money to buy coal and food and protect their children from the chill of winter. We were told, forsooth, that we should not discuss this question in the House because the Minister of Trade and Commerce had under his hand a Bill for the decapitating and disfranchisement of 50,000 of the Canadian people. That is not a sufficient reason for the Government's attitude; yet that is the only answer that was given from the other side of the House. In the forthcoming election I need no better argument than this to submit to the thousands of people in my constituency who depend for their livelihood upon their daily or weekly wage; when a question of vital importance to them was brought up in this House, the Government, led by the Minister of Trade and Commerce, put every obstacle in the way of the discussion of the matter. The minister says: to the dogs with food for the children; to the winds with the discussion of these matters; we have a decapitating axe to grind; we must cut off every power in this country that will criticise our misdoings; we cannot give you time to discuss this matter, because fifty thousand people have to be disfranchised, gagged, muzzled, we must have the time of the House for the discussion of that matter, not for the discussion of the matter brought up by the member for Pictou. Although I am accused of speaking frequently in this House, it is not often that I am thoroughly roused and stirred in expressing the views of the people. But when an old and respected parliamentarian like the Minister of Trade and Commerce says that we should not have an hour or two of the time of the House to discuss a matter of vital importance to the people, I feel that it is time the common people asserted themselves and contended that they should be heard in this House as well as the millionaires, the knights, the lords. Hon. gentlemen opposite talk in millions; they have more regard for the large amounts made by the lords and dukes who support the Government than they have for the needs of the workingman. But the time is not far off when the people will have an opportunity of passing judgment upon the conduct of this Government. No disfranchising Act that can be passed through this House will save the Government and the Minister of Trade and Commerce from the Bay-of-Fundy avalanche and tide that is approaching too rapidly for their own safety.

Sir GEORGE FOSTER: What kind of an avalanche is that?

Mr. McKENZIE: It will come from both sides—there will be an avalanche from the land and a tidal bore from the sea.

Sir GEORGE FOSTER: The bore is already here.

Mr. DAVIDSON: Will it be a smooth-bore?

Mr. SPEAKER: Order.

Mr. McKENZIE: I hear the piping voice of the sworn statesman. If he is looking for smooth things he had better consult his constituents on the question whether he will secure the nomination in Annapolis.

Mr. SPEAKER: Order.

Mr. McKENZIE: The Minister of Trade and Commerce said that we should be very careful not to encroach upon the rights of Great Britain in a matter of this kind. When the question of spending money over here is raised, regard must be had to Great Britain, but Great Britain is the whole Empire and the whole universe when we have to send men over there. We do not draw any line in this war; we are under the fold of the grand old flag—in Scotland, Ireland, England, Australia, New Zealand; it is all one Empire, one people. We have contributed, to the best of our ability, of the blood and wealth of this country, and we are still doing so. The Minister of Trade and Commerce says, with a flourish of trumpets and with that rhetoric which has made him famous: do you dare to suggest that Great Britain, although thousands of our men are fighting for her protection, should continue spending money in Canada in order to keep going the industries which the necessities of the war have produced and still call for? If that is the argument, then we must not ask any consideration at all from the authorities in Great Britain. All the sacrifices must come from our side; we must expect nothing in return.

The Minister of Finance has told us that what was to be cut off in the way of the

manufacture of munitions was a mere trifle; that we had plenty of money to keep these industries going.

He had hardly sat down when the Minister of Trade and Commerce took the floor and told us that the money we had to spend had better be spent in another way, namely, in purchasing food that was to be sent over to the other side, and that the cutting down of the production of munitions was not because they were not required, but because we did not have the money with which to buy them. We have reached a point at which the people of this country who have been engaged in the production of shells, which are so much needed for the Empire, must stop that work because the moneys of this country have been so squandered in other directions that we have not the capacity to come to the assistance of Great Britain in this connection. That is the conclusion and the argument made by the hon. member for Edmonton (Mr. Oliver) and not contradicted by hon. gentlemen opposite. Let me remind the Minister of Finance and the Minister of Trade and Commerce that if we are hard up for money, or if we need to economize in the expenditure of money, there is nothing which would give such a black eye to this country as to fall short in anything that is necessary for the carrying on of the war. We are told that we must purchase the Canadian Northern railway because to do otherwise might destroy the credit of this country. Anything that might happen to the Canadian Northern in the way of financing is a mere drop in the bucket, as compared with the great disaster to the reputation of this country that would follow our not doing everything we can in the prosecution of the war. If the choice is between putting $600,000,000 into buying munitions of war, bacon, cheese, wheat and everything else necessary to carry on the war properly and support our men at the front and supply our Allies with food and other things they want, and putting $600,000,000 into the Canadian Northern, I say: let us drop the Canadian Northern; let it get along the best way it can, and if it must go into the hands of a receiver, it is not the first enterprise of that kind that has found its way there; and let us pledge the country to that extent towards the carrying on of the war and furnishing the munitions and other supplies necessary to support the Mother Country in this desperate struggle.

The Minister of Trade and Commerce said that we on this side of the House belittled the efforts of Canada. I have not heard anybody on this side of the House belittling those efforts. I do not remember any one doing so. The financial effort of Canada has been magnificent. We are proud of the financial position we have taken and sustained. We hope we shall be able to continue to finance for the war and for the necessities of the Mother Country as we have done in the past. There is no man on this side of the House who has raised a finger against small effort, or great effort or any effort, put forward by the Minister of Finance to secure the requisite moneys for the part that we have taken in this war. Where is the truth in the statement made by the Minister of Trade and Commerce that we belittled those efforts or that we obstructed and impeded the measures taken to sustain this great country of ours in the war? Nothing could be further from the facts than the statement made by the minister. The Minister of Trade and Commerce has to-day made statements which are quite capable of giving comfort to the enemy in regard to the financial condition of this country. He told the world—and I do not think there was any necessity for it—that Great Britain was at the breaking point and strained to the last inch in connection with the financing of the war. I do not believe that. I do not believe that Canada is at or near the breaking point. There are in the banks of this country hundreds of millions of dollars owned by the people of this country, and if the requirements call for taking it out of the banks and giving it to the Minister of Finance in order to put it into the war, the people of Canada will rise in their might and hand over the money rather than that the status of this country should suffer for one moment on account of the need for money. We in Canada have scarcely been touched in regard to our true capacity in connection with the war, and it is not necessary for the Minister of Trade and Commerce to give comfort to our enemies to-day. It will be stated, I suppose, in Germany to-morrow that the Minister of Trade and Commerce of Canada, a knight, the Right Hon. Sir George Foster, said in the Canadian House of Commons that England was strained to the last inch and casting about perplexed as to how she could finance the war. That will be the encouraging news our enemies will receive to-morrow from a speech made in this House of Commons by a member of this Government. If anybody on this side of the House were

to make such a statement there would be loud cries of "Shame" from the other side. The Minister of Trade and Commerce says—and I agree with him—that the people of Canada from the Atlantic to the Pacific have behaved nobly. The person born in Canada, the person who came to Canada as an infant—the people of Canada generally of all classes and creeds—have done everything for the successful prosecution of the war that a true, loyal, capable people could do. If that be so—and it is so—there is not one instance of a disloyal act in this country on record to-day against anybody. And what is the reward that the Government gives to this loyal people who have stood to their guns, who have given of their money, of their children, of their blood, of their very life, for the maintenance of the flag under which they live? Their reward is to be cut off as aliens and strangers and traitors.

Mr. SPEAKER: Order. The hon. member is speaking beside the question.

Mr. McKENZIE: I am simply following the trail blazed by the Minister of Trade and Commerce.

Sir GEORGE FOSTER: The hon. member is following it very badly.

Mr. McKENZIE: I have pointed out that he has stated that the people have been doing very well. If the people are doing well, he is not rewarding them properly; that is, every one of the people of this country has stood by us loyally, there is no justification at all for cutting them off as is intended to be done.

Mr. SPEAKER: The hon. member is strictly out of order in discussing the Franchise Act.

Mr. McKENZIE: If I am out of order in discussing it, of course, I shall not discuss it. I simply wish to say to the minister—and that is not discussing the Franchise Act—that if three years ago his Government had told the people of this country what was going to happen, and the different Acts that were to be enacted by this Parliament and the course that was to be taken in respect to the rights of the people——

Mr. SPEAKER: Order. I must ask the hon. gentleman to confine his remarks approximately to the subject before the House. He is going very far afield.

Mr. McKENZIE: Thank you. Your Honour will not permit me to finish my sentence, but there may be other opportunities for pointing out what I was about to say. As far as the real question before the House is concerned, I do trust the Government will take the matter seriously in hand, and if those industries can be kept going by proper management, and the people of this country who are engaged in the production of shells can be kept at that production; and the finances of this country can be so husbanded and so marshalled that, while we may be obliged to drop other enterprises; while we may be obliged to drop the expenditure of some $20,000,000 or so on public works which I think can stand over; while we may be obliged to give up an expenditure of $4,000,000 or $6,000,000 on this old railroad in Quebec which I think we can dispense with; while we may be obliged to let the Canadian Northern, with the expenditure of $600,000,000 that it involves look after itself;—I do trust that the Government will finance every line of supplies that is required to keep up our present standing in support of this war, and that we shall have money for the wheat, and the cheese, and the hogs, and the munitons, that will be necessary in order to keep everything going at full blast as at present. We did something this afternoon to stir up the Government on these things, and if the motion of the hon. member from Pictou has resulted in stirring up the Government and giving to the world an idea of how we stand and what can be done in order to carry forward the affairs of this country and our share in the war in a way that will be satisfactory to the Canadian people, the afternoon will have been well spent.

[Mr. McKenzie.]

At six o'clock the House took recess.

After Recess.

House resumed at eight o'clock.

PRIVATE BILLS.

THE GORDON DIVORCE BILL.

On the order for resuming the debate on the proposed motion of Mr. Edwards "that Mr. Speaker do now leave the Chair for the House to go into Committee of the Whole House on Bill No. 126 (Letter T of the Senate) intituled: 'An Act for the relief of Albert Edwin Gordon'" and the proposed motion of Mr. Steele in amendment thereto:

Mr. KYTE: Mr. Speaker, I think the understanding last evening was that this Bill would not be gone on with until Monday. My hon. friend from Moosejaw (Mr.

Knowles) had intended to speak on it, and being compelled to leave last evening, he did so with the understanding that the Bill was not to go on until Monday. The printed evidence has only been distributed and members have not had an opportunity of reading it, as it is somewhat voluminous. I think, in view of the suggestion last evening, that it should go over until Monday, it would be rather unfair to hon. members who are interested in this Bill if it should be taken up to-night.

Mr. SPEAKER: If there is no objection, the order can stand.

Order stands.

SECOND READING.

Bill No. 131, to incorporate the Army and Navy Veterans in Canada.—Mr. Bradbury.

MANUFACTURE OF MUNITIONS.

MOTION TO ADJOURN HOUSE ON A DEFINITE MATTER OF URGENT PUBLIC IMPORTANCE.

House resumed the debate on the motion of Mr. Macdonald for the adjournment of the House for the purpose of discussing a definite matter of urgent public importance.

Mr. D. A. LAFORTUNE (Montcalm) (Translation): Mr. Speaker, I have listened with a great deal of attention to the arguments advanced by both sides upon the motion submitted to the House by the learned member from Pictou (Mr. Macdonald). This motion is certainly a most important one, if we may judge by the opposition offered by the hon. Minister of Trade and Commerce (Sir George Foster) to this motion being discussed, you have examined this motion, Mr. Speaker; you have paid a religions attention to the arguments brought forward by the hon. Minister of Trade and Commerce, and, in full justice, Your Honour has approved of the proposition submitted by the hon. member for Pictou and allowed the debate upon that question.

I fully concur in the remarks made by the hon. members on this side of the House. My hon. colleagues who have spoken upon this motion have perfectly satisfied me that they were absolutely right in presenting and in supporting this motion, I have likewise attentively listened to the arguments offered by the hon. members opposite; but however, they have not succeeded to change, in my mind, the opinion I have entertained on that question, from the very outset. The learned member for Cape Breton (Mr. McKenzie) has brought forward in support of his thesis the most cogent and the most serious arguments and he has surely succeeded in convincing his friends of the propriety of discussing this question. In my view, the hon. members sitting on this side and who, naturally, do not share the views held by the hon. members opposite, have successfully confuted the objections raised by these gentlemen.

From the very inception of this war which broke out in August, 1914, our whole population felt plunged in the greatest anxiety; consternation because general and all were wondering if this war would not be of long duration; opinions were divided then as they still are to-day. Some were asking themselves, from the very start, whether we, the native born Canadians, should participate in this war and if it was Canada's duty to take part in it. A great number were of the opinion that it was her duty to assist in this war, and others held a contrary view. Opinions are not yet agreed on this point, Mr. Speaker. Even at the present moment, a discussion is going on in the press as to the wisdom of the present Government's decision to the effect that it was Canada's duty to participate in this war. That decision was censured by serious and distinguished men, by great speakers who cut a figure in the political spheres and by-the-way, with a decided advantage, who have held contrary views. The view which I held and still entertain to-day, is that Canada had done her duty and that we were not obliged, in any way, to participate in this war; that under the constitution which governs us, we are not bound to take up the Empire's quarrels, in the wars it may have to stand. We have done it; so much the better. I still contend to-day that it was not Canada's duty to do what has been done, but since it was thought proper, I shall not discuss the wisdom of that measure, and everywhere I have had the opportunity to give my opinion, here as elsewhere, I have made no secret of saying what I say to-night.

It was then contended that Canada should, as a colony, put forth a war effort. If that so, it brings me to another consideration. Has Canada done her duty? Upon this point, Mr. Speaker, I have no better evidence to produce than to use the expression fallen from the very lips of the hon. Minister of Trade and Commerce, who has emphatically declared in

this House, to-day, that Canada had nobly done her duty and, for the first time, I agree with him: In making such a statement, he certainly did justice to the situation, to the sacrifices of every kind made by our country and I may immediately add that we have done enough. Everywhere I have been, I did declare and repeat that Canada had done her full duty and made ample sacrifices in men and in money, and I may repeat here to-night that, in my view, we have done all and more than we should have done.

From the very inception of this war, Mr. Speaker, a large number of munition shops and mills sprang up through the country, even factories which were previously running along different industrial lines were converted into munition workshops. We have made heavy sacrifices in order to provide as properly as possible for the operating of these manufactories so that they might supply, as much as possible, the ammunition required by our Allies.

In the county where I have the honour to reside, Mr. Speaker, there are several manufactories, several workshops, where munitions are produced. In St. Laurent, especially, we have an important factory, which employs a large number of hands.

In Lachine, the residential city of the member for Jacques-Cartier—I regret he is not in his seat to-night, for he might perhaps have given us more details and more information—in the city of Lachine, there are several munition factories. Considerable capital has been invested in the construction and operation of these factories. From personal knowledge, I may state that hundreds of thousands of dollars have been invested in the installation of such shops in the county of Jacques-Cartier and elsewhere.

There are hundreds of thousands of people employed in those mills. Young men and others of mature age, women and girls have been employed in large numbers, by thousands, in the manufacture of these munitions.

In several towns, even, the trade, occupation or work which these persons habitually followed were put aside so that they might devote themselves exclusively to the making of munitions. Workmen, painters, carpenters, blacksmiths, shoemakers, bakers, in a word every kind of working men gave up their ordinary labour, their habitual trade, to go and work in those shops. In the first place through devotion, then by patriotism and, thirdly, because the wages were larger. They found a more ample return for such a labour in those workshops. I have ascertained that a very large number of men employed in every line of trades and labour undertook this new occupation.

We were told, Mr. Speaker, that it was necessary, in the Empire's interest as well as for Canada's own interest, to perform that labour, to do what has been done. That's my opinion. There is no doubt that those who have taken up that work gave evidence of real devotion and of true patriotism, and it was necessary for them to do so in order to meet the requirements of the painful situation in which we found ourselves, and we can only praise and congratulate the people who so willingly undertook that kind of work, which was necessary and of interest to Canada.

I say, Mr. Speaker, that the population have made enormous sacrifices, both in men and in money. In the first place, it has been established that the number of those who have voluntarily enlisted exceeds 450,000.

France alone excepted, Canada has furnished more men than all the other countries of the world, in proportion to population. Canada occupies the second place on the list, coming immediately after France. Now, for a country that was not obliged to participate in the war; for a country whose constitution protected to the extent of allowing her to refuse even enlistment, it seems to me that a tribute of praise is due to the population who have been so anxious to efficiently enlist; in fact, as I have said, it is proven that 450,000 men have rushed to the colours voluntarily.

We have, moreover, subscribed millions and millions, Canada has made all kinds of sacrifices.

When I consider the sacrifices of all kinds, the sacrifices of every nature, the sacrifices of all sorts made by our people, I am asking myself whether the remarks made by the party in power, or by the papers supporting it, are really justified.

When some have stated that the province of Quebec was not generous, that the province of Quebec was not patriotic, when the people of Quebec have been blamed, censured, condemned and told most regrettable things, I reply to such gentlemen; you are wrong, you know

nothing of the sacrifices which have been made by the population of Quebec in particular and of Canada in general.

We have given millions and millions, over and above what the country could well afford. We do not regret it, for a good deed should never cause regret—that may perhaps bring us good luck later on; but I must say that the millions which have been given were paid generously, and no one could demand any more.

All the provinces of the country, from North to South, from East to West, all the provinces have been anxious to subscribe most generously, very willingly, millions and millions which have been sent oversea. The province of Quebec, Mr. Speaker, has not been the last one. From the very outset, our province has generously done it seems to me, her full duty, be it said to the praise of the Prime Minister of the province of Quebec who has been in power for many years past. We surely have nothing to find fault with him; to the contrary, we should congratulate him for his generous acts towards the Allies.

Many associations have been organized. In every corner of the country, societies have been formed, all collecting and working night and day in order to increase the subcriptions solicited, and they have certainly succeeded.

A large number of nurses, most generous women, most distinguished ladies, entered the fray and led the movement; we have seen nurses leave our country to go to the front; they left their families, their homes, their relatives; they left their country and crossed the seas to go and care for the soldiers on the battle fields. Those women deserve our sincere gratitude and our heartiest thanks for the devotion and the patriotism they displayed in the Allies' interests.

There have been organized in Montreal, among other cities, and throughout the country, concerts, theatrical representations, meetings of all kinds, shows, tombolas, receptions, afternoon teas, soirees matinées, levees, excursions, picnics, races, public and political gatherings. In fine, Mr. Speaker, every kind of things was done, all sorts of means were taken in order to relieve the soldiers at the front, thus it was that large sums of money were collected by all sorts of legitimate means; thus it was, I say, that they succeeded in raising very large amounts.

Work competitions were also organized. In my village, in my town and in the neighbouring parishes, they held sewing competitions to fit and clothe the soldiers on the battlefields. Bundles of clothing were sent overseas by the thousands. It was a consolation to see those devoted women, working day in and day out for the brave soldiers whose comfort was their sole inspiration.

I must say, in praise of all those ladies I know in my own town of Saint-Laurent, that their zeal was indefatigable. They worked in the evening, whole nights at a time, to sew and make all sorts of goods which could be useful to the boys at the front. Collections were made in the streets, from door to door, and even in the churches.

I must add here, Mr. Speaker, that our clergy answered the call most eagerly, When I see a certain press print and publish unpleasant articles against these gentlemen of the clergy, I have no hesitation in saying that those who so speak or write do not know our clergy, that they do not know the mentality of the province of Quebec. To say such things is evidence of the most complete ignorance of our clergy, for if there ever were people devoted to charitable works, to deeds of relief and protection, these are certainly the members of the clergy of Quebec. Yes, we have done all that was possible in the Allies' interest and, more especially for the Canadians fighting in France.

And if we consider the sacrifices made by Canada, is it necessary to add, Mr. Speaker, that the labour done in the munition shops, although the workmen were paid good wages for it, occupies a high standing on this list of honour? I have just said it the working men quickly left their regular occupations to devote themselves to the making of munitions and I do not hesitate to say, Mr. Speaker, that in so doing, they were moved by patriotism, by the hope of aiding the Allied armies and very few of them by the fact that their new wages were a little higher than those they were previously receiving.

As early as 1912, scarcely a year after the advent of the present Government into power, a serious crisis began to prevail; the working men complained of lack of work and I understand there was some reason for alarm. Every one wondered what was going to happen. Would these unemployed have to go to the United States for the bread and protection Canada was denying them?

As everybody knows, many of them did cross the forty-fifth boundary line and still a larger number were preparing to follow suit. In 1913, 1914, and up to the declaration of war, things were far from being bright. A large portion of our people were complaining and justly so. The war changed this condition of affairs. Labour has greatly increased and wages have been more remunerative. The working men's conditions have improved; they have been able to support their families properly, to meet their obligations and, moreover, to lay a little in store for the future. The workmen therefore have until now improved their position. It has just been learnt, as shown by the motion of the hon. member for Pictou, and with much apprehension, that this munition labour is on the point of ceasing. For some time I have had a personal knowledge of the fact, for in the country-place where I live, which is close to the town of Saint-Laurent, the Canada Store Co., which have, since 1914, been producing munitions and employing quite a number of hands, have begun discharging them. It is the same with the Dominion Bridge Co., in Lachine, and it is generally rumoured that this war industry may fully cease ere long. If that be so, it is a most regrettable affair. It is said that necessity knows no law, and the axiom is well known; but it seems to me that this work should not be discontinued, seeing that the war is still on and that it must unfortunately last too long, and seeing also that the munitions are absolutely indispensable for the war. I am asking myself Mr. Speaker, whether it is fair that Canada pay millions and millions to assist the Empire, the mother-country; whether it is fair to take our own country's money and send it over to London for the making of munitions to be used by those who are fighting for our country. Humbly I say: no. If it is necessary that we still contribute to help England financially, it seems to me that, at least, the millions we are to subscribe should be spent here, if possible. Is it right to take our money and send it oversea to manufacture the necessary fighting weapons which will be put into the hands of our boys from Canada? No, Mr. Speaker, justice demands that the money we advance, the money we subscribe for the manufacture of munitions, be spent in Canatda; if we do not do that, we are recreant to duty of justice. What will those workmen employed in munition shops say when they see themselves thrown on the streets, just before the bad weather, Autumn is close upon us and winter will soon follow. Where will these workmen find any work? In summer time, one can find something to do almost anywhere, as in navigation, in construction, for instance, and in a lot of other occupations, but such is not the case in winter, and hundreds and thousands of men, women and children will be given up to the greatest want, if we discharge them from the munition factories. I repeat it, if it is necessary to continue subcribing and advancing millions to the mother-country, let us see to it that, at least, the money we so advance remains in Canada, that the materials needed for the making of those munitions, such as iron, steel, copper, wood, etc., be materials taken from Canada. It seems to me only fair and just.

I was glad, Mr. Speaker, to hear the hon. Minister of Trade and Commerce state that Canada had done her duty. Very well! I agree with him, but he has been saying this only recently. The hon. minister and his friends have always declared, always maintained that Canada had not done her duty, and that it was therefore, necessary to impose—compulsory military service—to force those who had not contributed adequately, to discharge the duty they had neglected.

When I hear the Minister of Trade and Commerce reproaching the hon. member for Pictou (Mr. Macdonald) with being inconsistent, because he asked that the shell manufacture be continued in the country; when I hear the learned minister say: Don't you see how illogical and inconsistent, you are now, in asking that munitions continue to be manufactured in Canada, you who did not want to have anything to do with the war, who did not want to consent to the imposition of compulsory military service. And he tried to prove the inconsistency of the hon. member for Pictou.

I may say to the hon. minister that he is not more logical, and in my humble opinion, he is less consistent because the hon. member for Pictou did not contradict himself, did not show any lack of logic in asking that, inasmuch as it was necessary, if any munutions were to be made for the war, such munitions, at least, should be made in Canada. There is no contracdiction in that.

I, myself, have voted and I shall again vote most heartily against compulsory

military service; but I believe that, inasmuch as it is necessary to help, we should do so; but that the work to be done should be performed in our country, in our own people's interest.

The learned minister also said: England would not consent to have the work done anywhere but at home, to have her children deprived of it.

Well, I may reply to the learned minister; If England will not consent to have the work done outside her own territory, what about the children of the land?

England may do what she pleases at home, as long as she does it with her own money, her own resources, her own funds, very well; but when she takes Canada's money and resources, when she accepts the millions we are sending her, have we not the right to impose our conditions? When one gives, has he not the right to say: "Very well, I shall give you one hundred millions, two or three hundred millions, if necessary, but to my donations I put one condition: that that money be spent in my country, that the work be done by my children; if you think the donation is too onerous, don't accept it."

When in a donation a condition too onerous for the donee is put, the donee has only to answer your donation does not please me, it is not remunerative enough, it is not gratuitous enough, I will not accept it.

If England finds that the obligation we mean to impose, that of spending in our country the money we are giving her, does not suit her, she has only to say; I don't want it. There is no question but that the donor has the right to impose whatever conditions he please, when he makes a donation.

Let England accept the donations, the loans, the advances—call them as you please—under any form whatsoever, let her accept the money she receives from Canada, but, in return, let her show her generosity, let her be charitable enough—yes, I say charitable enough—to aid the children of the land, who are crying for bread and whom they are about to turn into the streets, just before winter.

The hon. Minister has made a remark which I have not quite understood. The learned member for Cape Breton (Mr. McKenzie) has told him so. I wish to offer a remark on the same point. The hon. Minister of Trade and Commerce has stated that the Opposition members were trying to belittle, to minimize what Canada has done for the Empire.

I beg the learned minister's pardon, he must have said that himself, in another flight of imagination. Without wishing to say anything disagreeable, or improper, let him allow me to tell him that when he stated that the Opposition members were trying and had tried to minimize, to lessen Canada's effort, attempting thereby to show that we have been recreant to our duty, I beg leave to tell him that he has made a blunder. Nothing of the sort has taken place, absolutely nothing.

I have followed the debates of this House, I have carefully listened to all that has been said; I have, as representative of my county, attended regularly enough the sittings of the House, and nothing has ever been said, nothing has ever been written in the Liberal papers, not even in the Conservative press which is opposing us, nothing has ever been said upon the subject; it has never been pretended that the members sitting on this side of this House had tried to minimize the efforts put forth by Canada, but it is the contrary that is true, and the truth of it is this: we have never tried to belittle the merit of the war efforts of Canada, but it has always been said, as I now declare it, as all my friends on this side have declared, that Canada had nobly done her duty, but we pretended that we had done enough, and never has it entered the mind of any one to criticize the common efforts put forth by the country, and especially by that part of the country where I live in. Nothing of the sort has been said.

Mr .Speaker, I cannot insist too much upon this fact; that if England has the munitions she needs made at home with the moneys we are giving her, in my humble opinion, she will commit towards us a serious injustice; the expression may be severe, I should like to find a more acceptable one, but I say so without any animus, without any mental reservation, or out of any feeling of disrespect for the Empire in which I live, but I do declare it would be committing a serious injustice to our country, if England took our funds and had the shells, the war ammunition, made over there, by her sons. Ours, first!

A country as powerful as England, the Queen of the world, cannot maintain itself without having to resort to Canada's money, so the hon. Minister of Trade and Commerce has stated. I regret he has made such a statement; yes, Mr. Speaker, I do regret that the hon. minister has gone so far as pretend that England is passing through a most difficult financial crisis and I particularly regret that he should have stated that England might perhaps be on the brink of

a precipice. Is it not an insult to the British Crown to so speak of a crisis which might menace England, the Queen of the world? I beg my learned friend's pardon, but I think he has committed a serious error and that never, either as a member or as a minister, should he put on record here such a statement. I ask the newspaper representatives here present not to make any mention in their columns of that statement from the hon. minister. That England is embarrassed by the war, I quite anderstand; but that she is passing through a crisis which threatens her existence, I think that such a statement is not warranted under the circumstances nor borne out by the facts, and that it should not have been made.

Mr. Speaker, there is a reason why I so earnestly ask that the greatest intelligence should preside over the use of the funds we are contributing. When the breaking up comes, when the partition is done, England as a belligerent on the first part, will preside over the division; the other great Allied Powers, who are now fighting with England, such as France, Russia, Italy, etc., will also come in for their shares. For them there will come a day for the rendering of accounts; they will perhaps be indemnified in a proportion more or less generous for the sacrifices they have made and for the losses of all kinds they have suffered. Will such be the case for Canada, a simple colony?

Is there a man in this House or throughout the country who would dare contend that, when the division ol the spoils takes place, Canada will be called upon to take her share in proportion to the sacrifices we have imposed upon ourselves? I say, no. We shall stay bowed down under the weight of the enormous debts we are piling up and under the burden of the taxes we shall have to pay for centuries to come; it will be utter ruin. You Mr. Speaker, myself and a great number of others around us, we shall see those things. But those who will come after us, who will have to pay those taxes, from generation to generation they will feel the weight of the burden we shall have imposed upon them. They will have to work like mercenaries; our children, our grand-children and our great grandchildren will have to bleed themselves, so to speak, to reimburse the millions we are spending in this nefarious war. Now, Mr. Speaker, does not that give us the right to say to our rulers today, who have in their hands our lives, all we hold most precious, have we not the right to say to these gentlemen that they must, in all fairness, give us the greatest sum of protection of sunshine and of liberty we are entitled to expect under the circumstances?

I cannot bear to hear the hon. Minister of Trade and Commerce lecturing those who, more or less, do not share his views. I may reply to this hon. gentleman that we also have a bit of land as big as his own, that we love our wives and our children as much as he can love his own, that our interests are just as precious to us as his own can be to him. Why suspect our disinterestedness and our patriotism? Why does he turn to his colleagues and to his friends, saying: See, the hon, leader of the Opposition has a smile on his face! Why should a man of the learned minister's standing, a man of mature age, a contemporary of the hon. leader of the Opposition, why should he utter such words? Why ask his friends to look at the leader of the Opposition because the latter smiles? I might ask the hon. minister if he ever saw on Sir Wilfrid Laurier's face anything but that air of simplicity, of justice, of broadmindedness which is a distinctive characteristic of great men? I wish my learned friend's face as well as mine could have that good smile which brightens the face of the leader of the Opposition, both he and myself would only be better looking fellows.

Mr. Speaker, I say that we cannot demand too much from those who rule us, under the circumstances, for every dollar we are giving, every dollar we are contributing, costs much to those who labour, to those who toil from morn till night time, to meet their obligatons.

The learned minister, as I have just said, has reputation, capacity, knowledge, probity, but does not the hon. member for Pictou have as much? Is not the reputation of the learned member for Pictou widely known? Is he not a distinguished orator, a most able man, an upright man who does honour to the mandate he fills in this House? Is he not an honour to his country? Does the learned minister doubt his sincerity? I should like to see in this House, several men as valuable as the member for Pictou. There is a large number of distinguished men on either side of this House, and it ill becomes the Minister of Trade and Commerce to try and belittle the reputation of those who

are here with him and who make a figure quite to their advantage.

The learned minister grows indignant and gets somewhat out of temper when he cannot subscribe to the conclusions arrived at by his opponents or accede to their views. It seems to me that the members on this side of the House have the same power, the same right as himself, as long as they act properly; it seems to me, I say, that the hon. minister does not need to become indignant, if our views do not coincide with his own, for his opinions have not always been in accord with our own. We have the same power he has, the same right, and if we do not subscribe to his opinion, he should not get out of temper.

We do not want, as stated by the learned minister, that this war keeps on, we desire, all and every one of us, that it end as early as possible, but as long as it does last, as the member for Pictou has so well expressed it, let us protect ourselves the best we can. No, we do not want this war to last. We are all anxious to see it over, but as long as it does last, it seems to me that we should do the best we can to improve as much as possible the situation. That is what the hon. member for Pictou asks, and the hon. minister says: You are lacking in logic, you want to prolong the war.

No, I beg the hon. minister's pardon. Neither the member for Pictou nor the other members on this side of the House want this war to last; on the contrary, our wish is that it may end as soon as possible; but as long as it lasts, let us protect ourselves, let us try and take advantage of the situation, the best we can, by demanding that the money we subscribe be spent in our own country.

Mr. Speaker, should the hon. members on this side of the House attempt to make a reflection such as that cast upon us by the Minister of Trade and Commerce, the hon. gentlemen opposite would be the first to say: You are fomenting sedition, you are preaching treason, you are making a conspiration. Should we take the liberty to pass a remark such as the learned minister has himself made from his own seat, this afternoon, I can assure you, Mr. Speaker, we should have a bad time of it. The hon. minister has made a reflection which we shall not make. We enter our protest and we say to the contrary; England is most powerful, she occupies a formidable position; England does not need Canada to save herself, she readily accepts whatever we are willing to offer her, but she is certainly not in such a financial state as represented by the Minister of Trade and Commerce.

I have said and I repeat that we have done our duty nobly. The reason why Canada has not done more has already been explained in this House. We have done more than we should have done; we have done, as far as possible, what had to be done, and I do not fear to assert that this is the general consensus of opinion.

Mr. Speaker, I resume my seat, in asking and asserting that the motion offered by the hon. member for Pictou is justifiable and that it should be favourably accepted by this honourable House.

Hon. J. D. HAZEN, (Minister of Marine and Fisheries): A definite matter of urgent public importance, for the purpose of discussing which my hon. friend from Pictou moved the adjournment of the House this afternoon, has now been considered and debated for a number of hours. I therefore beg leave to move, seconded by the hon. Mr. Cochrane, that this House now pass to the Orders of the Day.

Mr. PUGSLEY: I rise to a point of order, Mr. Speaker, before you put the motion. My point of order is—

Mr. SPEAKER: I will put the motion, then the hon. member may raise his point of order. It is moved by Hon. Mr. Hazen, seconded by Hon. Mr. Cochrane, that the House do now proceed to the Orders of the Day. Is it the pleasure of the House to adopt this motion? I may say this motion is not debatable, but I will permit the hon. member to rise to a point of order.

Mr. PUGSLEY: The point of order which I desire to take is that the motion for the adjournment of the House cannot be amended. This motion must be disposed of. The motion is made in virtue of Rule 39 and must be disposed of before the House can take up any other order of business. Bourinot says, at page 324, fourth edition:

> . . . . and it is the wish of the House to adjourn, it is necessary to move an adjournment of the debate in the first place, unless indeed it is desired to supersede it. But the adjournment of the debate obviously cannot be moved to the adjournment of the House, when it is a substantive question.

He cites 144 English Hansard 1906, and May, page 281. Then, at page 349 of the same edition, he says:

Motions for adjournment of House; of debate—

A motion to adjourn is not debatable except in the case of a special motion to adjourn, under Rule 39, made for the purpose of discussing a definite matter of urgent public importance. An ordinary motion to adjourn is always in order, but no second motion to adjourn may be made until after some intermediate proceeding has been had. An intermediate proceeding is one that may properly be entered on the Votes.

The special motion to adjourn under the above-mentioned rule is preceded by the member's asking leave to make the motion. This rule has already been fully quoted in Chapter IX, and it is unnecessary to repeat here.

The Speaker first decides as to whether the motion is in order, and the House decides as to whether it desires that the subject be discussed. In Great Britain, where a similar rule is in force, it has been held that the motion must be restricted to a single specific matter of recent occurrence, and if the matter, submitted to the House in pursuance of the rule, fails to obtain the requisite support, it cannot, during the same session, be again brought forward in the same manner.

Mr. SPEAKER: Order. I do not wish to unduly curtail the hon. member in rising to a point of order, but his last citation has absolutely no reference to the subject before us.

Mr. PUGSLEY: This is a substantive motion, and I simply quoted from Bourinot for the purpose of proving the correctness of what I said. I have already stated to your Honour that the adjournment of the debate cannot be moved to a special motion for the adjournment of the House. Would my hon. friend be good enough to state under what rule he makes the motion?

Mr. HAZEN: Under Rule 35.

Mr. PUGSLEY: (Reading):

A motion for reading the Orders of the Day shall have preference to any motion before the House.

Of course it would not have preference over a special motion to adjourn, under the spirit of the rule and under the clear reading of the rule, because that would entirely supersede and defeat the object of Rule 39, which is for the purpose of allowing discussion, and which has been introduced into the rules in face of the closure proceedings and in face of all those restrictive rules which were passed by the House in 1913. The object of this rule is to preserve to Parliament the right of discussion of important public matters. If an hon. member can rise in his place any time during that discussion after one speech has been made, or indeed even before one speech has been made, and avail himself of Rule 35, it is simply shutting off discussion and preventing an opportunity for discussion on a matter of grave public importance, which under Rule 39 has been permitted. Therefore, I say that rule is not applicable to a motion to adjourn under Rule 39 and cannot be resorted to; if it could, it would defeat the very purpose which the House of Commons had in view in providing for the discussion of matters of great public importance under Rule 39.

Mr. SPEAKER: With reference to the point of order raised by the hon. member for St. John (Mr. Pugsley), I would point out to him that his first citation has absolutely no bearing on the case: that is, with respect to the motion for the adjournment of the debate. This is not a question of the adjournment of the debate. It is a question of a superseding motion under rule 35. As I have pointed out, his second citation from page 349 of Bourinot has no reference to the point of order, because, while debate is provided for, it is subject to the rules of the House. Rule 35 is a specific rule, which reads:

A motion for reading the orders of the day shall have preference to any motion before the House.

That rule must be read in connection with rule 36, which I will read, as applying to this case.

When a question is under debate, no motion is received unless to amend it; to postpone it, to a day certain; for the previous question; for reading the orders of the day.

So that it is specifically provided in rule 36 that it is competent to move this motion in the midst of another discussion. The motion before the House is that the House do adjourn, but it is made under a specific rule, namely rule 39, which enables a discussion to take place, so that it is analogous to a substantive motion. I have given mature consideration to the matter, and I have no doubt in my own mind that the motion of the hon. Minister of Marine and Fisheries (Mr. Hazen) is in order, and is not subject to debate, and it is my duty to put it to the House forthwith.

Mr. PUGSLEY: I desire to appeal to the House from your ruling, Mr. Speaker.

The House divided on the question, "Shall the ruling of Mr. Speaker be sustained"?

YEAS.

Messieurs:

Armstrong (Lambton),	Morphy,
Ball,	Morris,
Bennett (Calgary),	Nicholson,
Bennett (Simcoe),	Robidoux,

Carrick,
Cochrane,
Cockshutt,
Donaldson,
Foster (Sir George),
Glass,
Guthrie,
Hartt,
Hazen,
Henderson,
McCurdy,
McLean
(Queens, P.E.I.),
Meighen,
Roche,
Rogers,
Schaffner,
Sevigny,
Sexsmith,
Shepherd,
Smith,
Stevens,
Taylor,
Thompson (Yukon),
Tremain,
Walker,
Weichel.—34.

NAYS.

Messieurs:

Boivin,
Brouillard,
Charlton,
Chisholm,
Copp,
Fortier,
Kyte,
Lafortune,
Lemieux,
Loggie,
Maclean (Halifax),
McCraney,
Michaud,
Murphy,
Oliver,
Pugsley,
Ross,
Sinclair,
Turgeon.—19.

PAIRS.

Messieurs:

Ministerial.	Opposition.
Alguire,	McMillan,
Ames Sir Herbert,	Delisle,
Arthurs,	Truax,
Barnard,	Achim,
Borden Sir Robert,	Laurier, Sir Wilfrid,
Bowman,	Loggie,
Boyce,	Lapointe, Ernest,
Brabazon,	Cardin,
Bradbury,	Cruise,
Burnham,	Proulx,
Burrell,	Douglas,
Chabot,	Beland,
Champagne,	MacNutt,
Clark, Hugh,	German,
Clements,	Knowles,
Cromwell,	Tobin,
Crothers,	McCoig,
Davidson,	Carroll,
Doherty,	Marcil,
Edwards,	Power,
Elliot,	Marcile,
Forget,	Bickerdike,
Fripp,	Devlin,
Green,	Buchanan,
Jameson,	Gauthier, L. J.,
Kemp, Sir Edward,	Robb,
Lewis,	Bourassa,
McLean, A. A.,	Hughes, J. J.,
McLeod,	Carvell,
Marshall,	Neely,
Middlebro,	Pardee,
Morrison,	Molloy,
Munson,	Boyer,
Northrup,	Martin,
Stanfield,	Macdonald,
Steele,	Bureau,
Stewart, Dugald,	McKenzie,
Sutherland,	Papineau,
Thoburn,	McCrea,
Wallace,	Lapointe, L. A.,
Webster,	Gauvreau,
White, Sir Thomas,	Graham,
Wilson,	Wilson,
Wright.	Warnock.

Mr. SPEAKER: I declare my decision sustained. Mr. Hazen moves, seconded by Mr. Cochrane, that the House do now proceed to the Orders of the Day. Is it the pleasure of the House to adopt the motion?

Mr. PUGSLEY: The motion is for another order.

Mr. SPEAKER: I have put the motion as I received it. Is it the pleasure of the House to adopt the motion?

Some hon. MEMBERS: Carried.

Some hon. MEMBERS: Lost.

The House divided on the motion of Mr. Hazen, which was declared carried on the following division:

YEAS.

Messieurs:

Armstrong (Lambton),
Ball,
Bennett (Calgary),
Bennett (Simcoe),
Carrick,
Cochrane,
Cockshutt,
Donaldson,
Foster (Sir George),
Glass,
Guthrie,
Hartt,
Hazen,
Henderson,
McCurdy,
McLean
(Queens, P.E.I.),
Meighen,
Morphy,
Morris,
Nicholson,
Robidoux,
Roche,
Rogers,
Schaffner,
Sevigny,
Sexsmith,
Shepherd,
Smith,
Stevens,
Stewart (Lunenburg),
Taylor,
Thompson (Yukon),
Tremain,
Walker,
Weichel.—35.

NAYS.

Messieurs:

Boivin,
Brouillard,
Charlton,
Chisholm,
Copp,
Fortier,
Kyte,
Lafortune,
Lemieux,
Loggie,
Maclean (Halifax),
McCraney,
McKenzie,
Michaud,
Murphy,
Oliver,
Pugsley,
Ross,
Sinclair,
Turgeon.—20.

PAIRS.

Messieurs:

Ministerial.	Opposition.
Alguire,	McMillan,
Ames, Sir Herbert,	Delisle,
Arthurs,	Truax,
Barnard,	Achim,
Borden, Sir Robert,	Laurier, Sir Wilfrid,
Bowman,	Loggie,
Boyce,	Lapointe, Ernest,
Brabazon,	Cardin,
Bradbury,	Cruise,
Burnham,	Proulx,
Burrell,	Douglas,
Chabot,	Beland,
Champagne,	MacNutt,
Clark, Hugh,	German,
Clements,	Knowles,

Cromwell,	Tobin,
Crothers,	McCoig,
Davidson,	Carroll,
Doherty,	Marcil,
Edwards,	Power,
Elliot,	Marcile,
Forget,	Bickerdike,
Fripp,	Devlin,
Green,	Buchanan,
Jameson,	Gauthier, L. J.,
Kemp, Sir Edward,	Robb,
Lewis,	Bourassa,
McLean, A. A.,	Hughes, J. J.,
McLeod,	Carvell,
Marshall,	Neely,
Middlebro,	Pardee,
Morrison,	Molloy,
Munson,	Boyer,
Northrup,	Martin,
Stanfield,	Macdonald,
Steele,	Bureau,
Sutherland,	Papineau,
Thoburn,	McCrea,
Wallace,	Lapointe, L. A.,
Webster,	Gauvreau,
White, Sir Thomas,	Graham,
Wilson,	Wilson,
Wright.	Warnock.

THE WAR-TIME ELECTIONS ACT.

Right Hon. Sir GEORGE FOSTER (Minister of Trade and Commerce) moved the second reading of Bill No. 133, the War-time Elections Act.

Hon. RODOLPHE LEMIEUX (Rouville): I rise to a point of order. Rule 73 says:

> All Bills shall be printed before the second reading in the English and French languages.

On referring to the Order Paper, I notice that Order No. 21 reads as follows:

> September 6—Second reading of Bill No. 133, the War-Time Elections Act.—Sir Robert Borden.—E.

The Bill, therefore, is printed in English only

Hon. ARTHUR MEIGHEN (Secretary of State): The Bill is printed in English and in French. It was printed in English the night before last and this morning copies of the Bill printed in French were sent to the distribution office at 11 or 11.30 o'clock.

Mr. PUGSLEY: I understand that the Bill has not been printed and distributed in the French language. It may have been printed, and kept in secret—I do not know about that. All we have to go by is the Order Paper; if the hon. gentleman will look at the Order Paper he will see that the Bill is printed only in the English language.

Sir GEORGE FOSTER: The rule that my hon. friend has read simply says that the Bill shall be printed before the second reading in the English and French languages. It does not say that that fact shall be indicated by letters here, there or anywhere else. The fact is that the Bill shall be printed in both languages. As I understand it, that has been done.

Mr. SPEAKER: I desire to consult the Clerk of the House as to what has been the practice in that respect.

Mr. LEMIEUX: I call Your Honour's attention to page 226 of Bourinot, edition of 1916:

> The rule which requires a strict adherence to the order paper is absolutely necessary to prevent surprise.

Some hon. MEMBERS: Oh, oh.

Mr. LEMIEUX: It would please the Tories to surprise.

Mr. BOIVIN: If I may be permitted, Mr. Speaker, I wish to say one word on the point of order. I draw Your Honour's attention to page 508 of the 1916 edition of Bourinot, which contradicts the statement just made by the hon. gentleman who is leading the Government (Sir George Foster) that it is unnecessary that the letters E and F shall appear on the Order Paper. Bourinot says:

> The letters E. F. on the order paper will show whether that has been done. If any objection be made on that ground, it will prevent the Bill being taken up for its second reading on that day.

That is very emphatic. As a matter of justice to the French Canadians in this country and to the French Canadians in this House, I may say that I applied for a copy of the Bill at the Distribution Office to-day at noon after I had seen the Order Paper, to make sure whether or not it had been printed in French. I was told by Mr. Boivin in the Distribution Office that the Bill had not arrived there at noon to-day. It would be absolutely unfair to go on with the Bill, especially in view of this remark of Bourinot's. I would ask that the matter be left over until Monday.

Mr. SPEAKER: It is not a question of fairness or unfairness; the Speaker is limited to a direct interpretation of the rules and to the past practice of the House. The rule says that all Bills shall be printed before the second readings in the English and French languages. There is no rule anywhere which says that the letters E and F must appear on the Order Paper, which is merely for the guidance of members of the House. I am informed by the Clerk that the practice in the past has been to be governed by the question of fact whether or not the Bills are printed in English and French before their second reading.

I hold in my hand Bill No. 133, printed in both French and English. I am, therefore, of the opinion that the requirements of the rule have been complied with, and I so rule.

Mr. BOIVIN: In view of the citation which I have just made to Your Honour, and which, I think, should be taken into consideration, as Bourinot is a recognized authority—

Mr. SPEAKER: Order.

Mr. BOIVIN: —I appeal to the House from your ruling.

The House divided on the question, "Shall the ruling of Mr. Speaker be sustained?" And the ruling was sustained on the following division:

YEAS.

Messieurs:

Armstrong (Lambton), Ball, Bennett (Calgary), Bennett (Simcoe), Burrell, Carrick, Cochrane, Cockshutt, Donaldson, Foster (Sir George), Glass, Guthrie, Hartt, Hazen, Henderson, McCurdy, McLean (Queens, P.E.I.), Meighen, Morphy, Morris, Nicholson, Robidoux, Roche, Rogers, Schaffner, Sevigny, Sexsmith, Shepherd, Smith, Stevens, Stewart (Lunenburg), Taylor, Thompson (Yukon), Tremain, Walker, Weichel.—36.

NAYS.

Messieurs:

Boivin, Brouillard, Charlton, Chisholm, Copp, Douglas, Fortier, Kyte, Lafortune, Lemieux, Loggie, Maclean (Halifax), McCraney, McKenzie, Michaud, Murphy, Oliver, Pugsley, Ross, Sinclair, Turgeon.—21.

PAIRS.

Messieurs:

Ministerial.	Opposition.
Ames, Sir Herbert,	Delisle,
Alguire,	McMillan,
Arthurs,	Truax,
Barnard,	Achim,
Borden, Sir Robert,	Laurier, Sir Wilfrid,
Bowman,	Loggie,
Boyce,	Lapointe, Ernest,
Brabazon,	Cardin,
Bradbury,	Cruise,
Burnham,	Proulx,
Chabot,	Beland,
Champagne,	MacNutt,
Clark, Hugh,	German,
Clements,	Knowles,
Cromwell,	Tobin,
Crothers,	McCoig,
Davidson,	Carroll,
Doherty,	Marcil (Bonaventure),
Edwards,	Power,
Elliot,	Marcil (Bonaventure),
Forget,	Bickerdike,
Fripp,	Devlin,
Green,	Buchanan,
Jameson,	Gauthier (St. Hyacinthe),
Kemp, Sir Edward,	Robb,
Lewis,	Bourassa,
McLean, A. A.,	Hughes, J. J.,
McLeod,	Carvell,
Marshall,	Neely,
Middlebro,	Pardee,
Morrison,	Molloy,
Munson,	Boyer,
Northrup,	Martin,
Stanfield,	Macdonald,
Steele,	Bureau,
Sutherland,	Papineau,
Thoburn,	McCrea,
Wallace,	Lapointe, L. A.,
Webster,	Gauvreau,
White, Sir Thomas,	Graham,
Wilson,	Wilson,
Wright.	Warnock.

Mr. PUGSLEY: I move that the House do now adjourn. I make this motion particularly because the Bill has not been distributed in French, and hon. members have a right to see the Bill in French.

Mr. SPEAKER: Mr. Pugsley moves, seconded by Mr. Lemieux, that the House do now adjourn. Is it the pleasure of the House that the motion be carried?

Some hon. MEMBERS: Aye.

Some hon. MEMBERS: Nay.

Mr. SPEAKER: In my opinion the nays have it.

(Some hon. members having risen as signifying their desire for a division):

Some hon. MEMBERS: Shame.

Some hon. MEMBERS: Oh, oh.

Mr. PUGSLEY: Do you allow these yellings, Mr. Speaker?

Mr. SPEAKER: Order. The hon. member is not in order in speaking when a vote is being taken.

Mr. PUGSLEY: Ah, Mr. Speaker, but—

Mr. SPEAKER: Order. Unless the hon. member takes his seat, I will certainly name him.

Mr. PUGSLEY: I will do that immediately.

Some hon. MEMBERS: Oh, oh.

Mr. SPEAKER: Order. If hon. members insist upon speaking while the vote is being taken, I will certainly name them.

Mr. PUGSLEY: On both sides?

Mr. SPEAKER: On both sides.

Mr. LEMIEUX: No yellings.

The motion of Mr. Pugsley was negatived on the following division:

YEAS.

Messieurs:

Boivin,	Maclean (Halifax),
Brouillard,	McCraney,
Charlton,	McKenzie,
Chisholm,	Michaud,
Copp,	Murphy,
Douglas,	Oliver,
Fortier,	Pugsley,
Kyte,	Ross,
Lafortune,	Sinclair,
Lemieux,	Turgeon.—21.
Loggie,	

NAYS.

Messieurs:

Armstrong (Lambton),	Morphy,
Ball,	Morris,
Bennett (Calgary),	Nicholson,
Bennett (Simcoe),	Robidoux,
Burrell,	Roche,
Carrick,	Rogers,
Cochrane,	Schaffner,
Cockshutt,	Sevigny,
Donaldson,	Sexsmith,
Foster (Sir George),	Shepherd,
Glass,	Smith,
Guthrie,	Stevens,
Hartt,	Stewart (Lunenburg),
Hazen,	Taylor,
Henderson,	Thompson (Yukon),
McCurdy,	Tremain,
McLean (Queens, P.E.I.),	Walker,
Meighen,	Weichel.—36.

PAIRS.

Messieurs:

Ministerial.	Opposition.
Ames, Sir Herbert,	Delisle,
Alguire,	McMillan,
Arthurs,	Truax,
Barnard,	Achim,
Borden, Sir Robert,	Laurier, Sir Wilfrid,
Bowman,	Loggie,
Boyce,	Lapointe, Ernest,
Brabazon,	Cardin,
Bradbury,	Cruise,
Burnham,	Proulx,
Chabot,	Beland,
Champagne,	MacNutt,
Clark, Hugh,	German,
Clements,	Knowles,
Cromwell,	Tobin,
Crothers,	McCoig,
Davidson,	Carroll,
Doherty,	Marcile (Bagot),
Edwards,	Power,
Elliot,	Marcile (Bagot),
Forget,	Bickerdike,
Fripp,	Devlin,
Green,	Buchanan,
Jameson,	Gauthier (St. Hyacinthe),
Kemp, Sir Edward,	Robb,
Lewis,	Bourassa,
McLean, A. A.,	Hughes, J. J.,
McLeod,	Carvell,
Marshall,	Neely,
Middlebro,	Pardee,
Morrison,	Molloy,
Munson,	Boyer,
Northrup,	Martin,
Stanfield,	Macdonald,
Steele,	Bureau,
Sutherland,	Papineau,
Thoburn,	McCrea,
Wallace,	Lapointe, L. A.,
Webster,	Gauvreau,
White, Sir Thomas,	Graham,
Wilson,	Wilson,
Wright.	Warnock.

Mr. LEMIEUX: I have just received, thanks to you, Mr. Speaker, a French version of the Bill now under discussion. Under ordinary circumstances, I think that the Government ought not to proceed with this Bill—

Mr. BRADBURY: These are extraordinary circumstances.

Mr. LEMIEUX: I think it is only fair to the French members of the House that they should be given time in which to read the Bill at least, which is a very bulky one. If I can appeal to the chivalry of my hon. friend to yield to my request, I will not make the motion which I am allowed to make under the rules. Otherwise, I shall move that we proceed to another order, under rule 36.

Mr. SEVIGNY: It is likely enough that some people would try to make a race question out of the alleged fact of this Bill not being printed in French. At twelve o'clock to-day I telephoned to the distribution office myself to inquire about this Bill, and was told that the French version had been distributed before twelve o'clock to-day.

Mr. GAUVREAU: Better bring your man and we will tell him that is a lie.

Mr. SPEAKER: Order.

Mr. LEMIEUX: I have a file of all the Bills printed in both English and French, and I can assure my hon. friend that this copy of the Bill which I have received from Mr. Speaker is the first one I have seen printed in French.

Mr. SEVIGNY: It was from me.

Mr. LEMIEUX: I thank my hon. friend for it. Will not my hon. friend accept the word of the hon. member for Shefford (Mr. Boivin), of the hon. member for Gloucester (Mr. Turgeon), of the hon. member for

Drummond and Arthabaska (Mr. Brouillard), and of the hon. member for Lotbinière (Mr. Fortier), all of whom say that this is the first time they have seen the Bill printed in French? It seems to me only fair that no surprise should be sprung on the members of the minority, and I would appeal to my hon. friend the Minister of Inland Revenue (Mr. Sevigny) to yield with good grace to my request. Besides, we are close to Sunday, and surely this is not a time to quarrel. May I expect a favourable answer from the Government?

Sir GEORGE FOSTER: I think my hon. friend may proceed with his motion.

Mr. LEMIEUX: I beg to move that the House do proceed to another Order, under Rule 36.

Mr. MEIGHEN: Mr. Speaker, I submit that this motion is not in order. It is the opposite to the motion which has passed the House, which was that we should proceed to the Orders of the Day. This gives the Government the right to name the orders to which we shall proceed.

Mr. SPEAKER: I do not think the hon. member for Rouville is in order in making his motion. Under rule 35 a motion for reading the Orders of the Day shall have preference to any motion before the House. We are now in the Orders of the Day and are considering a subsidiary order.

Mr. LEMIEUX: Read rule 36.

Mr. SPEAKER: Rule 36 has to be read in conjunction with rule 35. I still adhere to my decision, that the hon. member's motion is not in order, because we are now considering the Orders of the Day. The motion now before the House is for the second reading of Bill No. 133.

Hon. FRANK OLIVER: If the Bill is not worthy of any further explanation to the House on its second reading, it will be incumbent upon me to give my views in regard to it. I notice that the title of the Bill is the "War Time Election Act." We are reminded of the fact that this country is at war, and it may be as well at this particular juncture to consider for a moment why this country is at war. If I understand the issues correctly, we are fighting for the maintenance of free institutions and of human liberty, in Europe and throughout the world. It is generally recognized that at the head and in the forefront of that influence, of that power, of that principle against which we are fighting, stands Prussia and the principle of Prussianism. At the head of Prussia, as at the head of Germany, as the head of the Central Powers, as at the head of this world-war, stands the Kaiser, the representative on earth to-day of autocratic authority. But the Kaiser is only a part of the institution of autocracy which we speak of as Prussianism. Behind the Kaiser, supporting the Kaiser, forcing the Kaiser, if you like, is the junker aristocracy of Prussia supported by a military caste which is given an undue proportion of influence by a peculiar franchise Act. It is a notable fact that we who are fighting and giving of our resources to the limit, whose sons are dying to break down that condition as it prevails in Europe and which proposes to dominate the world, are to-day facing the introduction of an identically similar condition in this our own country, the introduction taking place under the name of patriotism, loyalty, and the maintenance of the principles for which we are fighting. The kaiser in our country is our Government, an oligarchy self-elected. It is supported, as it was created, by an aristocracy of wealth, an aristocracy which includes the munitions profiteers, the men who corner the food of the people, the manufacturing monopolists, the railroad exploiters, and the boa-constrictors of high finance. This is the junker aristocracy in our country. This is the organization that our kaisers across the floor represent, and this Bill, as its predecessor, the Military Voters Act, is for the purpose of establishing in this country a military caste with special voting powers and authority, to be depended upon by this junker aristocracy and this oligarchic kaiserism, who are proposing to give special voting privileges to special classes of people. It has usually been supposed that the institutions of government were for the benefit of the citizens, and that the climax of free government was control by the citizens. But we have it provided in the Military Voters Act, and in the War-Time Elections Act, that citizenship shall not constitute the right to vote, that there shall be a division between the right of military service and the right of citizenship. It is established that because a man is a soldier, though he never was a citizen of Canada, though he never intends to be a citizen of Canada, he still shall be a voter of Canada, and his vote shall be cast wherever it pleases himself, or those from whom he takes his direction, to cast that vote. In the War-Time Elections Act it is provided that our soldiers shall vote, that

their wives and their relatives shall vote, but that other women of the community shall not be entitled to vote. In order to create that special military class in this country we are to disfranchise the women of five of the great provinces of Canada just as, in order to establish a military class, we give the franchise to men who never saw Canada and probably never will see it. There is no argument, then, as to what the purpose, the intent and the necessary effect, of the legislation of these two Bills is and is to be. Frankly, the Government has proclaimed its policy in other matters along these same lines. We all recall that when the Prime Minister made his announcement of the introduction of the principle of conscription for military service into this country from his place in the House, he threatened with violence at the hands of the soldiery any man who, in this free Parliament and in this free country, dared to express his opinion against that measure.

Sir GEORGE FOSTER: Will my hon. friend say that that is a literal translation of the statement made by the Prime Minister?

Mr. OLIVER: No, I do not say it is a literal translation, but I say it is certainly a correct translation beyond any argument. Further, I will say that the word of the Prime Minister has been taken up, and the right hon. gentleman can read it any day in the columns of the special newspaper organs of the Prime Minister throughout this country—this hitherto free country of Canada. I do not know how far the Prime Minister and the oligarchy that sits with him are under the impression that they can terrorize the people of Canada. I do not know how many they can terrorize, but there are some whom they cannot terrorize. We still believe in right and liberty, we still believe in a free country. We who have sent our sons to fight for liberty in Europe intend to stand for liberty in Canada.

One of the great features of this Bill is its measure of disfranchisement of citizens of Canada. Although men shall have been entitled by the law of Canada, and under the authority of Britain, to the rights, privileges, immunities and liabilities of citizenship for a period of fifteen years, it pleases the kaiser, his oligarchy and his junker support, because he hopes thereby to secure the militarist support, to break faith—to break the faith of Canada—with these people and to deprive them of their rights as citizens. What are these men guilty of that they should be deprived of their citizenship? What have they done or what have they left undone that they should be singled out to be deprived of that right of which they became possessed in due and legal form and to which the faith of Canada and of the Empire was pledged at the time that right was granted them? What have they done? Have they committed a breach of the law? Have they in any degree acted against the best interests of this country? Have they refused to take part in this war with Canada on behalf of Britain and her Allies? Not so Mr. Speaker. We had it on the authority of the Prime Minister that the services of these men had not been accepted as a matter of Government policy since this war began. I ask you, Sir, on what ground have these men been disfranchised, except the ground that they stand accused, in the minds of our Government and its supporters, of the high crime and misdemeanor of being liable to vote Liberal at the next election.

Mr. LAFORTUNE: That is their crime.

Mr. OLIVER: That, and only that. Who are those people who are to be disfranchised? To be as brief as possible, and to avoid going into too many details, I would say they belong chiefly to two classes, men of German descent, and men of Russian descent.

An hon. MEMBER: Austrian.

Mr. OLIVER: If these people of German descent had come from Germany imbued with the ideas that are part of the education of every man in Germany, I could understand that there might be some question as to their attitude towards this country and our cause in this war. So far as my knowledge goes, and I have considerable knowledge on the subject, the great majority of the people who are spoken of as Germans in the Prairie Provinces, never saw Germany, their fathers never saw Germany, and their grandfathers never saw Germany, except it might have been in passing through Germany to come to Canada. Speaking of the large majority of those with whom I am familiar, their ancestors were Germans, but more than one hundred years ago they left Germany as colonists under the auspices of the empire of Austria, to occupy lands allotted to them in the Austrian province of Galicia, where they were given certain privileges and certain opportunities. It seemed good to them to go there, and one of the reasons they went was because they wished to escape from, or because they objected to, the es-

tablishment of German militarism which was then being established in their home country. They removed to Galicia and established themselves there. They grew, and prospered in a moderate degree, from generation to generation. When militarism became established thoroughly in Austria, those people found military service irksome, they found the economic conditions undesirable, and they emigrated to Canada. They came here on the promise by the Canadian Government, held out to every man who came, that if they came with good intent and with honest purpose to help build up our Canadian country, they would be entitled to and would receive all the rights of Canadian citizenship. They have done their part towards building up the country. They have fulfilled in letter and in spirit their part of the bargain; and because, for some reason unknown to me this Government believes that at the coming election they are likely to vote Liberal, these people are disfranchised. I care not on their account that they are disfranchised; it makes little difference to them, or, I may say to the Liberal party of Canada, or the prairie West. But it makes a stupendous difference to Canada that we shall have within our borders men of good faith, who have come in good faith, who have fulfilled every obligation laid upon them by the state in good faith, and with whom we break faith without cause or provocation. How can we expect to build up a sound and solid citizenship in this country under such circumstances? I consider that this so-called War-Time Elections Act will set this country back an untold number of years in the process of building up a united and progressive Canada. It is in the same class as the campaign which has been carried on persistently by those same gentlemen against the French-speaking population of the province of Quebec, a campaign intended to establish, and unfortunately only too successful in establishing, a division between the two great races in this country, a division that tends to weakness, because it tends to disunion at the very time when above everything else we need unity in order that we may have strength. What this Government has done persistently, has done through its organizations, through its orators and through its newspapers for the last eight or ten years, it is proposing to repeat now in the prairie West; attacking a different class of people, but attacking them with as little provocation and as little reason, and I am afraid with as deplorable results.

There is another class of people in the prairie West who will be subject to this disfranchisement. I speak of those who are generally known as Galicians. They also come in large measure from the province of Galicia, a province which is now Austrian, but which at one time was a province of Poland, and before that was a part of the country which was known as Little Russia.

Mr. R. B. BENNETT: There are also some from Bukowina.

Mr. OLIVER: Yes, I know some come from Bukowina. I do not wish to go into all the details. The conditions are somewhat different, the people, however, are identical in race. From the Carpathian mountains eastward, and from the Black sea northward, lies the country of the Little Russian people.

In ancient days there was a kingdom in that country, the capital being the city of Kief, now in Russia. At a certain period in history that part of Little Russia which is now Galicia became part of Poland by conquest, and the native people were made subject to the dominance of Poland. Later on, when Poland was partitioned, this section of Poland became a part of the Empire of Austria. So that in nationality these people are Austrians, but in race they are Russians; and, so far as this war is concerned, their sympathy is not with Austria but with Russia.

Mr. R. B. BENNETT: Is it not the fact that their sympathy is neither with Austria nor with Russia, but rather towards the establishment of another kingdom of the character of Little Russia, such as they had in days of yore?

Mr. OLIVER: It was very natural that, from time to time, these people should revert, in their minds, to the condition of their former greatness, and there is a proposition for the establishment of a Ukraine —that is, of a southern Russia kingdom independent of Russia at large. But that only establishes the point I make that their sympathies have not been with Austria or the Central Powers.

Mr. R. B. BENNETT: Is it not a fact that during the last six or eight months, a propaganda has been carried on by the Central Powers, on the promise given these people that they would establish them as an independent kingdom, and that their sympathies have found direct expression in favour of Austria and Germany, by reason of the propaganda carried on in Canada

directly from those countries and also from the United States.

Mr. OLIVER: I can quite appreciate that these people would be very receptive to a propaganda that would look to the re-establishment of their race and kingdom, but I have yet to learn that the propaganda has been carried on in the name of Germany or Austria. I have no doubt it was financed by Germany and Austria, but never carried on in their name, so that the people have no reason to look with gratitude to Germany or Austria because of that propaganda. Those who are not entirely pro-Russian are looking to an independent state of Ukraine or Little Russia, and in no case is their sympathy in any degree with the Central Powers, either Germany or Austria, although they were citizens of Austria.

Mr. R. B. BENNETT: Is it not the fact—and I know it from personal inquiry—that among the Galicians, who are of Austrian descent, settled in Alberta, there is a very considerable number who have relatives, some holding the rank of general, fighting in the Austrian army, and that the ties of blood are very, very strong with them, and these ties are manifested very frequently?

Mr. OLIVER: I do not wish to argue the point, but if that is to be a reason for disfranchising these people in Canada, what is to be said of the royal family of England, many of whose close relatives are fighting with the Germans? As a matter of fact, the people referred to are citizens of Austria, and being in Austria they are subject to the military rules of Austria and must fight, of course, with the Austrian army. But I am speaking of these people as a race, and particularly of those of that race who are in Canada. Their sympathies, beyond any question, are not with Austria; they are either with the prospective Little Russia, or with Russia as she stands to-day. The loyalty of these people to Canada has never been questioned, except by the Government in so far as it has refused to accept their offers of military service. I want to say to this House that when the war broke out there were specific offers of military service made by people of the Russian race—Ruthenians, Galicians, or whatever you are pleased to call them, offers to raise military forces to join the Canadian Expeditionary Force. For good or bad reasons, these offers were refused. But I know that in many individual cases members of that race are to-day members of the expeditionary force, and are serving overseas. I should think that fully half of the 218th Battalion, with Colonel Cornwall in command, is made up of men of this Little Russian race. I do not know how they got by the policy of the Government which prohibited their enlistment, but, at any rate, it is a fact that the 218th Battalion went away from Canada with fully half of their members of that particular race, and there never has been any reason to question the loyalty of those people to Canada.

There is another class of people mentioned here, people of German speech, who were residents of Russia before they came to Canada. These people were in much the same position as those I have spoken of, residents of Galicia. They were colonists from Germany over a hundred years ago. Many of them colonized under Catherine II. They have lived there for generations, and have maintained their German speech. They enjoy certain special privileges, but not knowing Germany, except as a matter of memory or tradition, and having no part in kaiserism or junkerdom. They came to Canada. They have been good citizens of Canada, and ready and willing to do their part in everything connected with the war, or with the maintenance of the rights of Canada or the citizenship of Canada. I am sorry my hon. friend from Victoria (Mr. White) is not present, but I heard him say that, in all his constituency a certain settlement of German Moravians from Russia—if I do not mix the conditions up too much—were the most liberal contributors to the Patriotic Fund in that district.

Under these circumstances, I consider this Bill is without excuse and without reason. If there were any suggestion of bad citizenship, of disloyalty under conditions of war, if there were any circumstances that would make an excuse for this enactment, they should be known; but I say there are none, speaking of these people as a whole—and if there are any individual cases, then I say those individual cases are to be dealt with just as others would be. That is what a government is for. There has been a great deal of provocation given those people in the early stages of the war; I am not blaming anybody for it but I merely state the fact that, in the early stages of the war, the Mounted Police were ordered to collect all firearms from these people.

Suppose a man has been a citizen of Canada for fifteen or twenty years and his stake in the country, as is the case with

some of these people, runs into tens of thousands of dollars. If a mounted policeman goes into his house and demands the shotgun that he uses for shooting rabbits or partridges, he would not be very favourably impressed with the conditions of the country in which he lives. I have yet to hear of any disturbance or of any objection to this procedure; the people recognized that there was a war on; that difficulties had to be met. So far as I am aware, they submitted to that condition without a murmur, although they did consider that it was an unnecessary hardship—and I consider so, too. In the light of these facts, when the Government of Canada comes forward with an Act like this—breaking the faith of the Dominion with these people; declaring that their citizenship is no good, telling them in effect that they are not wanted in this country on terms of equality with other citizens—a blow is being struck at the progress and unity of this country that this Government will be answerable for and that will do this country more harm than the Government can ever do it good.

As I said in the beginning of my remarks: what is the offence of which these people are guilty, or of which they are expected to be guilty? There is only one thing that they can do in the case of an election; they can vote; that is all. They must vote for the candidates represented at the polls; presumably they must vote either Conservative or Liberal. If they are being disfranchised, it must be because it is expected that they will vote Liberal. Because, therefore, a citizen of Canada is suspected of an intention to vote Liberal, he is to be disfranchised by the act of this Government, which holds authority not from the people of Canada, but by the vote of this Parliament. Is it the intention of this Government to attempt to make the world believe that the Liberals of Canada have less heart in the prosecution of this war than the Conservatives have? If that is the intention, it is an attempt to brand within a fraction of half the people of this country as being disloyal. Is that a good way to strengthen Canada as one of the forces of the Empire? Is it true, Mr. Speaker? The place to find out whether or not that is true is in the casualty lists, not in the numbers of the safety-first brigade. If the casualty lists from one end of this country to the other are examined it will be found, if loyalty is measured by service and sacrifice, that the Liberals of Canada have done as much as our friends on the other side. I will go further, and say that the time has gone by when the putting on of a military uniform is an evidence of service. The men who are fit for service in this war and have not offered themselves for such service are subject to rebuke. But what is to be said of the men and the officers in thousands who are wearing the uniform and drawing the pay without rendering the service? These are found in the ranks not of the Liberal party, but of the Conservative party.

I do not know upon what information the Government founded their idea that they were going to secure an advantage by passing this legislation. But I say to them that if I know the English-speaking people of the West—and I think I do—this legislation will not appeal to them. They are in that country to build it up, with the assistance of those who are established alongside of them, who have been given the same rights of citizenship; and they realize that the only way in which a united country can be built up is by giving equality of rights. They will realize, when this legislation is introduced, and the rights which they enjoy are withdrawn from their neighbours, that permanent injury is done to them in every capacity as settlers and builders of the country. No party bickering in the election that is to come would ever compensate for that unfortunate condition. While the Government may, as a result of this legislation, disfranchise thousands of the persons whom they are pleased to call enemy aliens, they will establish in the minds of the fair-minded and right-thinking English-speaking people of the West an absolute belief in their injustice, their unfairness, and their unfitness to carry on the government of this country.

Mr. ONESIPHORE TURGEON (Gloucester): Mr. Speaker, in rising to make a few remarks on the Bill now before the House, I am not actuated by selfish motives. As far as I am concerned, the Bill in question will have no prejudicial effect in the county which I have the honour to represent. In New Brunswick, particularly in the county of Gloucester, the only change affected by this measure will be in respect of the female vote of relatives of soldiers who have gone to the front. Of course, the greater the number of voters who go to the polls, the larger the majority will be.

I protest most earnestly against some of the principles involved in this Bill, particularly the disfranchisement of so-called alien enemies. We have boasted during the past twenty-five or thirty years of the immigration to Canada from the countries of central Europe. The people who have

come from those countries have been among our best citizens; they have shown loyalty and devotion to the institutions of Canada and of the British Empire. Most of them left their native land in order to free themselves from the yoke of European rulers and they admit to the world the advantages they enjoy in this new country. They are amongst our best citizens, in regard to not only loyalty, but work. They have raised the greatest crops and have shown an example to the Canadian farmers who have settled around them. It has been my privilege to meet some of them on different occasions, and to travel amongst them for days and days at a time. I have met them as I have met other Canadians. When they mingled together with the English Canadians and French Canadians, you would not know, were it not for their pronunciation, that they were foreigners. From their views and aspirations, you would consider them, not as strangers, but as brothers living under the same flag and the same institutions. It has been my privilege, on a few occasions, to address meetings largely composed of Austrian and German settlers in Saskatchewan and Alberta. On one particular occasion I attended a large convention of farmers in the riding of Red Deer, Alberta. The convention was held in the town of Prevost, where farmers of Austrian, German and other European nationalities had gathered together. I was able to judge of their aspirations and of their love for the country in which they were living, and I remember the hearty applause with which my words were received when I spoke of the liberties which they, together with other Canadian citizens, were enjoying under the British flag on this side of the Atlantic. That was about eight or ten days before the declaration of war, and their conduct ever since has been worthy of true British citizens. We induced those people to come here under the promises we made to them. We promised them, that when they came to Canada, they would enjoy all he privileges given to British subjects on this side of the Atlantic, and they have come here under those promises. Those promises have been made to the world at large. We expect more immigrants to come to Canada after the war is over. They may not come from Germany or Austria—I presume we shall not receive them for a number of years—but they may come from Russia, France and Belgium. If the people of Canada do not remain faithful to the pledges and promises made to the immigrants who came to Canada before the war, how can the world at large depend upon the promises of Canada in the future? We want immigrants to come to Canada; we shall need them by the thousands, and we must to-day give the same guarantee to the world for the future as we have given for the last thirty years. It is on account of those promises that those people have come to Canada. Pledges should be maintained, should be respected. We have given guarantees to certain classes of immigrants who have come to Canada. I refer to the Mennonites and Doukhobors, who have been guaranteed that they will not be called upon to perform military services, and this Bill respects those guarantees. Why then not respect the guarantee given to those other people who have come here and have enjoyed the privilege of citizenship and have shown themselves worthy of it? The statement has been spread broadcast throughout Canada that those people in the western provinces have been most generous to the Patriotic Fund. It has also been stated that some of those men are in the field today risking their lives in defence of Canada. Yet by disfranchising men of German or Austrian birth in this country, we are putting into the minds of the younger men of those nationalities, who in a few years will be of age to exercice their franchise, resentment against Canada on account of the pledges made to them being broken. I trust the Solicitor General or Minister of Mines—when I look at him I am more apt to call him the Solicitor General, because I believe the duties of that position are more in accord with his natural proclivities—will again consider the matter and exercise his legal acumen as well as his patriotic proclivities in the direction in which he should have exercised them when he framed this Bill. This is a question of principle; it is a question of pledges to the world, of pledges to those people who have come here and the prosperity that the West has enjoyed during the past number of years has been, to a certain extent due to the flow of immigration to Canada as a result of those pledges. After the war is over, we shall require perfect accord and harmony amongst all our population, and we shall not have immediate harmony in this country after the war is over if this Bill goes into effect and inspires distrust of the pledges of Canada.

I have always been in favour of giving the vote to our soldiers. It has been my privilege to say in this House before that I am willing to give the vote to soldiers of the age of eighteen years who have en-

listed voluntarily, because in that manner they have testified to the world, and more particularly to Canada that they have studied the questions of the day and have felt it to be their duty to fight in defence of the liberties they enjoy under our constitution. It should, therefore, be the privilege of Canada to endow those soldiers with the franchise. I have no objection to the relatives of soldiers being permitted to vote. But if the Government desire to extend the franchise to the female relatives of the soldiers, why not extend it to the women of Canada at large? By this Bill, an injustice is done to the women of five provinces of Canada, namely, Ontario, Manitoba, Saskatchewan, Alberta, and British Columbia, who have the right to vote under the present law. Those women have acquired that right, and have shown themselves worthy of it, and this Bill limits the women suffrage to the female members of the families of our soldiers. While the wives and sisters of our soldiers deserve the vote, many of the women in those five provinces are just as worthy of having the franchise as members of the families of our soldiers.

How many young men have offered their services and been rejected by the medical officers, and have gone home with tears in their eyes? I have seen them myself in my home town of Bathurst, in Gloucester county, where about twenty-five per cent of the men who offered their services were rejected by the medical authorities. Is not the mother or sister of a rejected volunteer just as worthy of a vote as the mother or sister of the young man who has been accepted and gone to the front? There is no difference between the two families at all. Why not extend the vote to all the women of Canada? While the women of the eastern provinces have never agitated very much for the franchise, they are just as capable of exercising it with intelligence and loyalty as the women of the West. I admit that the women of the West, related to the young men who have gone out there, have made a special contribution to the development of the country by helping to colonize and build up new territory. At the same time the women of the East are just as well able to exercise the franchise as those of the West. Why should not the franchise be given to the women of all the provinces?

I rose merely for the purpose of offering these few remarks. I trust that the Government will still further cogitate over the provisions of this Act. I trust that they will not take away the franchise from the people of the West, and that they will extend the franchise to the women of every province in this country.

Hon. ALBERT SEVIGNY (Minister of Inland Revenue): I should like to say just a few words on a point that was raised a few minutes ago, when it was contended that the Bill now under discussion was not printed in English and French. As I said before, I made inquiry about twelve o'clock to-day at the distribution office to see if the Bill had been printed in French, and was assured that it had been printed in English and French and had been distributed. Let me read to the House a declaration by Mr. T. W. Alexander, assistant distributor:

> Ottawa, September 8, 1917. Bill 133 was received at 12.15 and immediately distributed. Hon. Mr. Sevigny telephoned at 12.30 and I assured him that the Bill, French and English, was distributed to all the officials. I have personally investigated and have seen that the Bills were distributed in the boxes of the French members.
>
> (Sgd.) T. W. Alexander.

I have also the following declaration by Mr. Boulet, Chief of Pages:

> Mr. Alexander of the Distribution Office notified me about twelve that the Bill was ready in French, and in accordance I notified the pages to file the same, and the Bill was filed as usual.
>
> (Sgd.) E. Boulet.

Mr. PUGSLEY: I think the proper time to discuss this would be before the Orders of the Day are called on Monday, when the hon. member for Shefford, who is now absent, would probably be present. My hon. friend must know that he is out of order. The question is on the second reading of the Bill.

Mr. SPEAKER: There is no doubt at all that the question before the Chair is the second reading of the Bill. Now that the hon. member for St. John has raised the point of order, I must rule that the hon. member cannot proceed. The reason I did not interpose before was that I thought that the House would like to be seized of the facts on this point.

Mr. GEORGE E. McCRANEY (Saskatoon): This Bill, which is described as the War-Time Elections Act, has some features about it of special interest to the public. It enfranchises women, with certain restrictions, in the eastern provinces, and with certain exceptions it disfranchises the women of Ontario and the western provinces. We have been led to believe by

discussions in the public press that the Government was going to revert to the old plan of having a Dominion franchise, as apart from a provincial franchise. If that had been done the question would have come to us in this Parliament as a new one altogether, whether or not we should enfranchise women. It was, however, made very clear by the Solicitor General in introducing this Bill that the provincial franchise in the various provinces was to be adopted with certain exceptions. The Solicitor General said:

> By this Bill the provincial franchise is adopted in every province of Canada, including Alberta and Saskatchewan. It cannot of course be adopted in the Yukon as there is no Yukon franchise. The provincial franchise, subject to the operation of the two principles I have described in the foregoing part of my address, is adopted in every province, including Alberta and Saskatchewan.

We are now considering whether we shall disfranchise a great many women and leave only a comparatively few with the vote in their possession. This
11 p.m. Bill also disfranchises large classes of male electors especially in western Canada. Of the enfranchisement of women who are the next of kin of soldiers, I heartily approve. It is a measure of enfranchisement; it is class legislation; it is not based on any principle except relationship, although in introducing the Bill the Solicitor General did put forward the proposition that the franchise was being given in virtue of the services and sacrifices of the women on whom it is conferred. As a matter of fact, it falls very far short indeed of conferring upon all those women who have given services and made sacrifices the franchise to which they are entitled.

If we had never before had manhood suffrage and at this time we were considering the question anew, we might make alterations in the manhood suffrage law and might prescribe qualifications, general in their character, which we have not done. But in regard to manhood suffrage, we have laid down certain qualifications, and it becomes most difficult at this time in our political history to restrict those qualifications. In the eastern provinces the Government propose to enfranchise only women who are next of kin of soldiers, and they pass judgment upon the good works of that great body of British and Canadian-born women who have been spending their days, since the commencement of this war, in patriotic service, in Red Cross work, and in all those activities in which women can take part and by which they can show their loyalty to the soldiers at the front and the Empire. In regard to the women of the western provinces and Ontario, the case is stronger, because the franchise is general as to women. In Manitoba a registration has taken place. Women have already taken their share in the provincial elections in Saskatchewan and Alberta, and in British Columbia the vote has been given to them. With discrimination against British-born and Canadian-born women, this Government declares that all the work they have done day after day is not sufficient to qualify them to vote for members of Parliament, that they shall stand aside from that class in which they have been placed under provincial statutes, and that only those shall vote who vote by virtue of their relationship.

It is said that women hesitate, that they do not register and vote readily. In the city of Saskatoon a year ago there was a registration of voters under our provincial Act. At that time we had a visit from the right hon. the Minister of Trade and Commerce, and he was a witness to the efforts we were making to secure a complete registration. He lent us the aid of his eloquence in pointing out the obligations of citizenship, and I am sure that his appeals both to men and women were successful in assisting us in getting the fullest possible registration. The result was that over 6,700 men and women in that one city were registered, and there were 50 more women than men. I understand that in the recent registration in Winnipeg there were more women than men registered. We have found throughout the cities of the West that the women are willing to take their part in public affairs; that they will not only register but that they will vote as the occasion comes. It will surprise me very much if, in view of the declaration of the Government that this franchise which is now given is based on the provincial franchise, women will without protest be disfranchised and be put alongside of the foreigners of alien enemy birth in their disfranchisement.

Mr. CROTHERS: My hon. friend speaks about the proposal of the Bill to disfranchise women in the five western provinces of Canada. Will he be kind enough to tell us when and where women in Canada have ever been entitled to vote for members of this House? I may be mistaken, but I have the idea that we are not disfranchising them. To disfranchise women is to take

something from them that they have already. We are not proposing to take anything from them which they already have, because they have never been entitled to vote so far as I am aware.

Mr. McCRANEY: My hon. friend is telling me and telling the House something that is not new to us.

Mr. CROTHERS: You speak of disfranchising them.

Mr. McCRANEY: Yes.

Mr. CROTHERS: We are not doing that.

Mr. McCRANEY: I am speaking of it in reference to the provincial franchise and in reference to the declaration of the Solicitor General that they were adopting the provincial franchise with the exceptions that he mentioned.

Mr. CROTHERS: We cannot disfranchise them as far as the province is concerned, if we would.

Mr. McCRANEY: My hon. friend will have to follow his own logic.

Mr. LEMIEUX: The Prime Minister promised them the franchise.

Mr. CROTHERS: No.

Mr. McCRANEY: My hon. friend from Rouville (Mr. Lemieux) reminds me of the pledge the Prime Minister made to them a few days after his return from England, in which he promised a measure of woman suffrage with some restrictions. It appears that this is the measure which is given to the women of this country in fulfilment of the pledge of the Prime Minister, and according to the words of the Solicitor General this is the provincial franchise with certain restrictions.

Mr. MEIGHEN: I did not say "restrictions."

Mr. McCRANEY: I have already quoted the Solicitor General's language and I shall not misrepresent him. If the Prime Minister had said nothing about it his position would not have been so difficult, but it is certainly misleading to the women of this country, in view of the fact that five of our provinces had given as wide a measure of franchise to women as to men, to assure them that there would be an enfranchisement of women with restrictions, when the vote is only given to the near relatives of the soldiers who are overseas.

With regard to the disfranchisement of the male population, there is no doubt that, while this is described as the War-Time Election Act, the very evident purpose of it is to re-elect the Government party.

The two parties must take care of themselves and this Government understands the principle of "safety first." I must say, it seems to me that there will be, in the Western Provinces at any rate, very little result to the Conservative party. If it were only political results that we were dealing with at this time, I would say it matters very little whether one party or another attains a political result. I am speaking now apart from the promotion of the war. Whether the Liberal party or the Conservative party holds power for the next five years and takes a political advantage of an Act, any effect of that kind will soon pass away. But there are facts which will not pass away in the years after this Government passes out and another government comes in. Those are the permanent results, especially in western Canada, which arise from the fact that we have invited into our country some hundreds of thousands of immigrants from Europe and from the United States, that we have offered to them a part of our natural heritage, that we have invited them to partake of the civil rights which we possess, and that upon their good citizenship and their residence for a certain length of time among us, they will have all the privileges of electors which we ourselves had. Out of those hundreds of thousands we now propose to select certain of them and say, "Notwithstanding the fact that you have behaved yourselves, that you have committed no disloyal act, step aside, you shall not come near when we elect a new Parliament." The danger of this is the stigma of disloyalty which is cast upon a comparatively small body of our immigrants, and I think it is much smaller than the Government imagines. We put this before the whole class of people who have come in from all the countries of Europe, and we give them notice that some day it will be their turn, and that some other class may be dealt with as we now propose dealing with those of alien enemy origin. We are going to say to those people, now being disfranchised: "We shall put you in the same position as are the negroes of the southern portion of the United States." And when our people in western Canada are put by the Conservative party in the position of the negroes in the South, and are disfranchised in this way, I think they will remember it for many years to come.

Mr. MEIGHEN: Does the hon. gentleman say they will be in the same position as the negroes have been in for the last fifty years and that during all that time the negroes have been denied the franchise?

Mr. McCRANEY: I understand the negroes of the South were enfranchised for quite a number of years, but that by laws of the various legislatures the Democrat party has taken away from the negroes the rights they had. If my memory serves me, they have, for instance, made certain provisions in the State of Virginia, under which no negro can vote whose grandfather did not have the right to vote, or something like that—at any rate, they have got them out of voting. That is what the Government proposes to do with this class of immigrants. The result is the same, and the stigma is the same. In western Canada, we have large numbers of foreigners who will be affected by this Bill. I have before me a phamplet entitled "Immigration Facts and Figures" issued by the direction of Hon. W. J. Roche, Minister of the Interior, 1917, giving the immigration into Canada, and containing a statement of the total immigration to Canada by nationalities from July 1st, 1900 to March 31st, 1917. I have selected from this list those who are of alien enemy origin, namely, Austro-Hungarian, Bulgarian, German, and Turkish. I will give the House the result of my investigations. In the period from June 30th, 1900, to March 31st, 1911, there came into this country from Austro-Hungary, 200,016 persons; from Bulgaria, 32,267 persons; from Germany, 38,807 persons; from Turkey 4,552 persons, a total of 275,642. In determining the number who came in from Turkey, there are four classes mentioned, Turkish-Arabian, Armenian, Egyptian, and Syrian. I have only included in these figures of 4,552 the Turkish and the Arabian. Under the Bill which we are considering, the Government gives the franchise to Armenians and Syrians, so I have not included them. neither have I included Egyptians, because, while nominally Egypt is under Turkey, it is so under British rule that I would not regard any Egyptians as being of alien enemy birth. My recollection is that with regard to the Syrians and Armenians, if they are Christians they are given the vote. I do not know what standards this Government is going to use, whether they will use the Shorter Catechism and the Westminister Confession, or the Thirty-Nine Articles, or the Canons of Roman Catholicism—and I do not know to what tests they would subject themselves if they proposed to qualify in this way. It is proposed by this Bill to disfranchise those who had not taken out their citizenship before 31st December, 1902. I am including now, for the purpose of ascertaining the population against which this disfranchisement would operate, those who came into the country from 1900 to 31st March, 1911, and I do that because those who came in after 31st March, 1911, would not be able to take out naturalization papers, because their term would be up during the war, and my understanding is that no certificates of naturalization have been issued since the war began up to the present time. Consequently I find that the total immigration which has come into Canada from 1900 to 1911 is as follows: Austria-Hungary, 121,001; Bulgaria, 12,124; Germany, 21,145; Turkey, 2,997—a total of 157,267. I said a moment ago that I thought the political result would be much less than the Government anticipated. Out of that total of 157,000, nearly one-half would be women. There would be, and still are a large proportion of minors. There would be the removals which have taken place from this country, say to the United States; there would be some who returned to Europe again; and there would be a good many deaths in the population. I should be surprised if the number who would be actually disfranchised by this Bill would run over 30,000. If only such a small political result could be got out of it by this Government, with such tremendous consequences in this country, the result would not appear to justify the measure. This population is scattered chiefly through the provinces of Manitoba, Saskatchewan and Alberta. They are mostly a farming population. I have been in western Canada for over fifteen years. When I first went West I went to Rosthern, fifty miles south of Prince Albert, which was almost wholly a foreign population. If I owe my entry into political life to any one thing more than to another, it is to the fact that I had gained the confidence of people of the very class that this Bill proposes to disfranchise. Not one of those who were there at that time would be entitled to the franchise, because they all came in after 1900. But I must say, from my intimacy with them, having seen the progress which they have made in their social life, having seen the success with which they have carried on their business, having observed with a good deal of interest their progress in Canadianism and their attempts at un-

derstanding the problems which we have, I want to protest as strongly as I can against the treatment which this Conservative Government proposes to give to these Galicians, Bukowinians and various people from Austria. The Mennonites are somewhat like the Quakers, and this Bill disfranchises them. Quakers and others of similar belief in England may hold their objections and vote. These people in the province of Saskatchewan have no representative of their own in our legislature, which is little short of sixty members. In the province of Manitoba they have one representative, Mr. T. D. Ferley representing Gimli. I am not sure whether there is another, but at most there are not more than two. In Alberta they have only one representative. The result is that they trust the Canadians, and that is why I am here, and that is why the other members from Saskatchewan, Alberta and Manitoba, all of British origin, are here. We have their confidence and the confidence is mutual, and if they trust us we trust them, and that is the way to get along. If that population in western Canada were represented, either by their own people, or by a class of representatives which was not endeavouring to lead them into the best lines of Canadian citizenship, I could understand why it might be thought by Parliament that the franchise given to these people was a pernicious influence in public life. The great question which has been before Parliament during this session was the question of conscription. All the members in the province of Saskatchewan were for conscription; in Manitoba all save one, and in Alberta all save one. What does that mean? It means that the Liberals, who are in this House because of the support of the very people whom we propose to disfranchise, have not been influenced, as the Conservative party would suspect, by the alien enemy, but have taken the position which they believed to be right. They have supported conscription. They are willing to go back to their people and make what effort they can to educate them to their duties of citizenship, and whether successful or not, at any rate they will take the consequences of what they have done. I should be surprised if the Galicians and Bukowinians were in favour of conscription. They left the country from which they came in order to get away from war. I do believe, however, that an appeal to them upon grounds of Canadian patriotism and citizenship would be worth while. If they were not brought to the conscription side, in which the Liberal representatives who are here speaking for them believe, they would at least be brought to a neutral position in the matter.

While speaking of the position of the western Liberal who represents them and of his willingness to take a chance, to accept responsibility for their political education, I may point out that there is one party in this House that will not take a chance, and that is the Conservative party. What is the attitude of hon. gentlemen opposite towards those members of the Liberal party who are willing to take that chance? I probably can speak of this as other members from the West cannot, because I do not expect to be a member of this House again. I do feel, however, that in placing this measure of disfranchisement before Parliament—a measure against which we protest; a measure in respect of which we must accuse the Government of the most partisan conduct—the Government by their own Act are throwing the gravest doubt upon the judgment that we have exercised in supporting their measure of conscription. I was elected by a considerable number of Mennonites, Galicians, Doukhobors, Ruthenians, Hungarians, Norwegians, Slovaks—possibly as cosmopolitan a rural population as there is in western Canada. Without going back to them for their opinion, I voted for an extension of Parliament. During the six-year term the last year of which was the result of my own vote, am I to disfranchise the very people by whose authority I was sent here, and whose authority I respect? Am I to tell them that although I have overstepped one year of my term, they are not fit to re-elect me as their representative?

It was argued that they will be exempt from military service, and that that is one reason why they should be disfranchised. I do not think that is a good reason for disfranchising them. If the reason put forward for their disfranchisement is that, being conscientious objectors, they are not subject to military service, then it would follow that none should have the vote except soldiers and those unable to serve as soldiers—those over age, for instance. I am sure that the Government does not intend anything of the kind.

The Prime Minister is at the head of the Royal Northwest Mounted Police. He has frequent conferences with its officials; he is more familiar than most of us are with the police records of the country and

with the conduct of those who live in western Canada and who come under the supervision of the mounted police, including those of enemy alien birth. As one in public life, I hear a good deal that goes on, and I have never heard the suggestion that there have been any disloyal movements among these people of alien enemy birth in western Canada. I have always understood that they were a law-abiding people. The Solicitor General pays a tribute to them. I say that if without discrimination this Government should put them all in the same position, it is wrong; they should not place upon them the stigma of disloyalty to the country to which they have come and in which they are taking a full share of citizenship. To do that is not only unfair, it is cruel; it is unjust to many well-meaning people. If there were some instances in which men of enemy alien birth had disobeyed the law, evidenced unpatriotic tendencies, or proved traitors, that would be no worse than what has happened in Montreal. We have been horrified to find that so near the capital there are persons who dynamite, who commit murder, who have assassination on their programme. It is not proposed to disfranchise French Canadians simply because Lalumière and some of his friends have got into trouble. The fact is that this question, like many others that come before us, is not distinctly a western question. I find that the people of Ontario are more worked up over the disfranchisement of foreigners in the West than the people of the West are. The speeches that have been made in this House demanding the disfranchisement of foreigners have, with the exception of the speech of the member for Calgary (Mr. R. B. Bennett), and of the Secretary of State, who introduced the Bill, been made by Ontario men. I was in the East in 1896 when the Manitoba School question was an issue. We were very much stirred up in Ontario and Quebec over the Manitoba School question, and on election day Manitoba was the only province that gave a majority for the Conservative Government, indicating that they took very little interest in the school question compared with the East. In 1905 I was in the West when the Northwest School question was up, under the terms of the Autonomy Act. We were not very much disturbed about it out there; we knew all about it. But when I came down to Ontario I found that the question was deemed to be a most serious one. Most of the troubles that we get into in western Canada are fomented in Ontario and Quebec; I am glad that we live 1,500 miles away from both of those provinces. Ontario and Quebec have fattened on their religious differences and racial strifes. A year ago the bilingual question was up in this House. What was the attitude of the western men? We voted against the provincial resolution. We did not want to express an opinion on the matter; we did not want a racial question entering into our politics in western Canada. We have troubles enough out there, and we settle them. I venture to say that the matter we are now considering, like the most of the trouble that we now have, has been worked up here amongst the soldiers. If the Conservative party could only settle with our Ontario friends, they would not have much trouble over this matter.

A word with regard to the machinery of the Bill. In the two provinces of Saskatchewan and Alberta we have always been under the law of the Dominion of Canada, which has, I think, originated in 1887: Registration by enumeration is familiar to us, and so it will not give us very much trouble. In Saskatchewan we abandoned the system of the tied ballot which is preserved in Alberta and which is adopted in this Bill. We did away with it for the reason that it was very open to fraud. The tied ballot is a temptation to unscrupulous people to open the envelope and substitute another ballot. That was the reason why we did away with that system in Saskatchewan. I do not know what the experience of Alberta has been, but to me it seems that, in this legislation, one of the worst features of that old system which was carried on in the Northwest Territories has been preserved. In Saskatchewan we had enumeration under the Dominion Act, and we used it in our provincial elections of 1905 and also of 1908. Before 1912, the Liberal Government of Saskatchewan thought it would be a good thing to have lists, and we had lists. We found that the temptation was too strong; that the registrars usually wanted to put on their own partisans and leave off the other fellows. We, therefore, did away with lists, and we have no lists in our rural districts. But in our four cities of Regina, Saskatoon, Moosejaw and Prince Albert we have a registration, and a new list is prepared every time. We take no old list as a basis. The registration to which I referred at the beginning of my remarks was the registration upon which the election in the city of Saskatoon was conducted recently. I want

to suggest this point to the Government—that the practice to which people are subject and with which they are familiar is a desirable practice to continue; and I would suggest that, in place of enumeration, in the cities of Saskatchewan at any rate, the Bill should provide for a registration in which everybody appears—and in which there is a proper appeal and the whole question of the right of a man to vote is settled before election day. My objection to the tied ballot, apart from the question of fraud, is that the voter has to be kept near the poll until his right to vote is settled. Adjournments may take place from time to time, and it is not often convenient for a voter to have to stay around day after day in order to find out whether the ballot he has cast shall be counted. I believe it will be very much to the satisfaction of the people in our cities that the voters' lists shall be settled before election day. If that is done, people can go about their business, and there is not the uncertainty which there is bound to be if perhaps some hundreds of ballots are tied up and the result is not known, and for days and days people must be kept about the cities until their qualification is settled.

Another suggestion I would like to make to the Government is that they should have a special provision for voting by commercial travellers and railway men. We have that in Saskatchewan. The voting takes place covering two or three days, if I remember rightly, before the actual polling day. In our last provincial election, the system worked out most satisfactorily. We want to get away from railway influence. It has been customary for railways which take an interest in elections to send out on long runs men who are not of the proper stripe so that they will not get back by election day. All that kind of thing is avoided by the system I have suggested. I hope the Government will take into consideration the suggestions I have made in regard to registration in our cities and also as to the addition of railway men and commercial travellers to the voters' list.

Mr. SINCLAIR: My right hon. friend who leads the House (Sir George Foster) looks tired; it is now within ten minutes of the Sabbath Day, and even with all the bad legislation that we have passed the Fourth Commandment still stands. I beg to move the adjournment of the debate.

Sir GEORGE FOSTER: Before the adjournment of debate, I beg leave to give notice that immediately before the Order of the Day is next called for resuming this debate, I will move that the same be not further adjourned.

Motion agreed to, and the debate adjourned.

Mr. PUGSLEY: You are taking the closure over Sunday.

On the motion of Sir George Foster, the House adjourned at 11.55 p.m.

Monday, September 10, 1917.

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

WAR TIME ELECTIONS ACT.

MOTION FOR APPLICATION OF RULE 17B ON SECOND READING OF BILL CARRIED.

Sir ROBERT BORDEN moved:

That the orders of the day be now read.

Sir WILFRID LAURIER: Will the right hon. gentleman state the reason for the motion.

Sir ROBERT BORDEN: The reason is that we desire to proceed to Order No. 22 on Government orders.

Sir WILFRID LAURIER: The Franchise Act?

Sir ROBERT BORDEN: Yes.

Sir WILFRID LAURIER: It is a very important measure. We have no objection on this side.

Motion agreed to, and Orders of the day read.

Sir ROBERT BORDEN moved:

That the House do now proceed to Order No. 22 on Government Orders, resuming adjourned debate on the motion of Sir George Foster for the second reading of Bill No. 133, the War Time Elections Act.

Mr. KNOWLES: I beg to—

Mr. SPEAKER: This motion is not debatable.

Mr. KNOWLES: By the unanimous consent of the House, I might briefly state my position in regard to the Private Bill which appears on the Order Paper, for the relief of Albert Edwin Gordon.

Mr. SPEAKER: The motion does not afford debate.

Motion agreed to.

Sir GEORGE FOSTER moved:

That the debate upon the second reading of Bill No. 133, the War Time Elections Act, shall not be further adjourned.

The motion of Sir George Foster was carried on the following division:

YEAS.

Messieurs:

Armstrong (Lambton),	Morphy,
Bennett (Calgary),	Morris,
Bennett (Simcoe),	Northrup,
Best,	Paul,
Borden (Sir Robert),	Reid,
Boys,	Robidoux,
Bristol,	Roche,
Burnham,	Rogers,
Clements,	Schaffner,
Cochrane,	Scott,
Doherty,	Sevigny,
Donaldson,	Sexsmith,
Edwards,	Shepherd,
Foster (Sir George),	Stevens,
Glass,	Stewart (Hamilton),
Guthrie,	Sutherland,
Hanna,	Taylor,
Hazen,	Thompson (Yukon),
Henderson,	Thornton,
Lalor,	Tremain,
Lewis,	Walker,
Maclean, (York, O.),	Wallace,
McLean (Queens, P.E.I.),	Webster,
Meighen,	White (Sir Thomas), —48.

NAYS.

Messieurs:

Chisholm,	Laurier (Sir Wilfrid),
Copp,	Lemieux,
Devlin,	Loggie,
Ethier,	McCraney,
Fortier,	Marcil (Bonaventure),
Gauvreau,	Michaud,
Graham,	Murphy,
Hughes (Kings, P.E.I.),	Oliver,
Knowles,	Pacaud,
Kyte,	Proulx,
Lapointe (Kamouraska,)	Pugsley, Sinclair.—23.

PAIRS.

Messieurs:

Ministerial.	Opposition.
Armstrong (York, O.),	Nesbitt,
Alguire,	McMillan,
Ames, Sir Herbert,	Delisle,
Arthurs,	Truax,
Ball,	Turgeon,
Barnard,	Achim,
Bowman,	Brouillard,
Boyce,	Cardin,
Brabazon,	Demers,
Bradbury,	Cruise,
Burrell,	Douglas,
Chabot,	Beland,
Champagne,	MacNutt,
Cockshutt,	Charlton,
Clark, Hugh,	German,
Cromwell,	Tobin,
Crothers,	McCoig,
Davidson,	Carroll,
Elliot,	Marcile (Bagot),
Forget,	Bickerdike,
Fripp,	Devlin,
Green,	Buchanan,
Jameson,	Lachance,
Nickle,	Kay,
Kemp,	Robb,
McCurdy,	Maclean, A. K.,
McLeod,	Carvell,
Marshall,	Neely,
Middlebro,	Pardee,
Morrison,	Molloy,
Munson,	Boyer,
Merner,	Martin,
Smith,	Ross,
Stanfield,	Macdonald,
Steele,	Bureau,
Stewart (Lunenburg),	McKenzie,
Thoburn,	McCrea,
White (Renfrew),	White (Victoria),
Wilson,	Wilson,
Wright,	Verville,
Weichel,	Lanctot,
Sutherland.	Papineau.

Mr. A. K. MACLEAN: I was paired with the hon. member for Shelburne and Queens (Mr. McCurdy). Had I voted, I would have voted against the motion.

Mr. BURRELL: I was paired with the hon. member for Strathcona (Mr. Douglas). Had I voted, I would have voted for the motion.

Mr. DEVLIN: I voted, understanding that the member for Ottawa (Mr. Fripp) had another pair. I understand now that I have remained paired with Mr. Fripp, and I should like to recall my vote.

Mr. SPEAKER: The hon. gentleman cannot recall his vote.

Mr. NEELY: I was paired with the hon. member for East Elgin (Mr. Marshall). Had I voted, I would have voted against the motion.

Mr. BALL: I was paired with the hon. member for Gloucester (Mr. Turgeon). Had I voted, I would have voted for the motion.

Mr. ARTHURS: I was paired with the hon. member for South Bruce (Mr. Truax). Had I voted, I would have voted for the motion.

Mr. BRADBURY: I was paired with the hon. member for Dauphin (Mr. Cruise). Had I voted, I would have voted for the motion.

Mr. DOUGLAS: I was paired with the hon. member for Yale-Cariboo (Mr. Burrell). Had I voted, I would have voted against the motion.

Mr. TURRIFF: I was not paired, and I intended to vote for the motion, but I was not paying attention when the vote was taken.

Sir EDWARD KEMP: I was paired with the hon. member for Huntingdon (Mr. Robb). Had I voted, I would have voted for the motion.

Mr. CROTHERS: I was paired with the hon. member for West Kent (Mr. McCoig). Had I voted, I would have voted for the motion.

Mr. ELLIOTT: I was paired with the hon. member for Bagot (Mr. Marcile). Had I voted, I would have voted against the motion.

Mr. GREEN: I was paired with the hon. member for Lethbridge (Mr. Buchanan). Had I voted, I would have voted for the motion.

Mr. DAVIDSON: I was paired with the hon. member for Cape Breton (Mr. Carroll). Had I voted I would have voted for the motion.

Mr. McKENZIE: I was paired with the hon. member for Lunenburg (Mr. Stewart). Had I voted, I would have voted against the motion.

Mr. KAY: I was paired with the hon. member for Kingston (Mr. Nickle). Had I voted, I would have voted against the motion.

Mr. THOBURN: I was paired with the hon. member for Sherbrooke (Mr. McCrea). Had I voted, I would have voted for the motion.

The House resumed consideration of the motion of Sir George Foster (Minister of Trade and Commerce) for the second reading of Bill 133, The War-Time Elections Act.

Mr. J. H. SINCLAIR (Guysborough): This Bill if passed will not do me any harm. I stand to gain by it. The proposal to enfranchise the female relatives of the soldiers will probably increase my majority by a considerable amount. I have no alien citizens in my constituency, but there are Conservatives there who are fair-minded and who like to see fair play, and, if I judge them rightly, they will resent this measure. It is not giving away any secret to say that that is the feeling generally on this side of the House. We on this side of the Chamber feel that, in the step that is being taken now, the Government have over-reached themselves. There is a feeling in this country that a man should take a fighting chance. He takes it in western Canada, and he takes it in eastern Canada. Among the school boys in the province from which I come the desire for fair play is almost a passion, and there is always a feeling of contempt for the man who takes a mean advantage, the man who hits below the belt.

The danger of this measure is that it lends itself to fraud. While our party stand to gain in some particulars, we stand to lose in others. The administration of this measure in some cases, no doubt, will fall into the hands of dishonest officials. The provisions of the Bill, so far as I have been able to learn, are complicated and intricate. Permit me to make a proposal, Mr. Speaker, that you should scrutinize this Bill from first to last and give me your honest opinion about it. I confess when I read it, and when I discovered the complicated provisions relating to the tied ballot which has been abandoned in western Canada, I believe, for some years, because it was notorious for the frauds brought about under it. When I saw the extraordinary power that was given to irresponsible local enumerators, and the provisions relating to the soldiers' grandfathers and the Syrian Christians, I felt in my own mind: for God's sake, what kind of franchise are we going to have in this country if the Secretary of State (Mr. Meighen) continues to tamper with it, twist it and bedevil it, as he has been doing for the last two or three weeks. It reminds me, Mr. Speaker, of the German buccaneers in Southwest Africa, whose plan was to fight the British forces in the present war by poisoning all the wells. The title of the Bill is "The War-Times Elections Act." Let me suggest to the Secretary of State that he change the name, and call it "The War-Times Prussian Junker Act." The idea behind this measure is military autocracy. We, on this side of the House, I am proud to say, stand for democracy. If hon. gentlemen opposite want autocracy, why go to all this trouble to get it. They can get it without resorting to such a measure as this. All they have to do is to hold up their hands, lay down their arms, and the Kaiser will give it to them. Military autocracy is the same wherever you find it. British military rule or Canadian military rule is not one whit better in its aim than German military rule.

Some hon. MEMBERS: Order.

Mr. SINCLAIR: It is only a question of degree. We had military rule in Britain long ago. We had it in Ireland in the days of Oliver Cromwell; the memory of it exists in Ireland yet.

Mr. MURPHY: They have it there yet.

Mr. SINCLAIR: We had it in Scotland in the days of the "big killing," when my countrymen and the countrymen of other gentlemen in this House were shot like wild beasts in the glens and hills because they insisted on their right to worship God according to the dictates of their own conscience. Thank God these days are past in the old land, and they are also past here, and, notwithstanding the puny efforts of hon. gentlemen opposite, they will never return. But it becomes necessary for us at this late date, 1917, to reassert the doctrine that every man has a right to have a say in the election of the representatives of the people; to have a voice in the determination of who shall govern the country in which he lives.

This Bill contains three main provisions. First, it disfranchises about a million women who live between the Ottawa river and the Pacific coast. The women of these five provinces are now entitled to vote. That is in direct violation of a resolution of this House, moved by the Prime Minister; it is in direct violation of what every man in this House and in this country understood to be the pledge of the Prime Minister. Why was it done, Mr. Speaker? It would not have been done if the Government could profit by abstaining from it. This Government have scoured the world for votes; they have given votes to men who never saw Canada, who never set foot in Canada, and probably never will. The only explanation of their conduct in disfranchising the women of Canada in these five provinces is that they believe they will vote against the Government. I do not need to refer to the self-denial and fortitude of the women of Canada and the way that they have helped to carry on this war. I do not need to say that the women of Canada deserve better treatment at the hands of this Government.

The second provision of the Bill enfranchises the female relations of soldiers, both East and West. I heartily agree with that provision of the Bill. The only objection that can be made to that provision is that it is class legislation; it is not fair to those who have been left out, practically all of whom have made great sacrifices for the cause for which we all stand.

The third provision of the Bill is the most important one; it disfranchises men of alien birth. I submit that this provision is a vicious one; it is a breach of faith on the part of the Government of this country. We invited these people from northern Europe to come to Canada. We promised them land; we promised them the rights of citizenship; we promised them protection under the flag. We boasted that we had such a thing in this country as British fair play. We assured them that Canada was the home of liberty and the refuge of the oppressed from every land. They took us at our word—and what are we doing now? We are branding them as outlaws and as perjured traitors. After three years residence and good behaviour, they came forward to take the oath of allegiance in order that they might become naturalized British subjects. This is what they promised:

> I do sincerely promise and swear that I will be faithful and bear true allegiance to His Majesty King George V as lawful sovereign of the United Kingdom of Great Britain and Ireland and of the Dominion of Canada, dependent on and belonging to said kingdom, and that I will defend him to the utmost of my power against all traitorous conspiracies or attempts whatsoever which shall be made against his person, crown and dignity, and that I will do my utmost endeavours to disclose and make known to His Majesty, his heirs or successors, all treasons or traitorous conspiracies or attempts which I shall know to be against him or any of them, and all this I do swear without any equivocation, mental evasion or secret reservation. So help me, God.

They took that oath, and we have the testimony of hon. gentlemen who have lived among them that they have kept it faithfully. We are now preparing to break our promise to them, and in doing so we put ourselves in the same position as that taken by the German Kaiser. What will President Wilson say about this action on the part of the Canadian Government? He has sent out a clear call to the young men of the United States. He has taken high ground; he has summoned half a million men to the colours. What for? To establish the great principle that every free man has the right to help select the government under which he is to live. He refuses even to negotiate with a government that does not hold office by the voice of the people.

I object to this measure, first, because it is designed to serve party and not public ends; second, because it is despotic and unjust in so far as the disfranchisement is concerned. If the Government of this country, assisted by closure and backed up by a political machine called the Senate, can disfranchise one class of the people, what is to prevent them from taking a like step in regard to any other class that is suspected of being hostile to the Government? Why not, Sir, disfranchise every man who joins a labour union in this country? There is no reason why the Government should

not do that. That is what is in their hearts and minds; they only lack the courage to do it. They have not done it because they dare not do it. Do the gentlemen composing this moribund Government think that the Galicians and the Moravians have no friends? Let me say to hon. gentlemen opposite that the hatred of tyranny is in the heart of every free man, and, once kindled, it has to be reckoned with. It was to vindicate this principle that we fought the South African war.

Going back to the history of that event, you will find that British intervention was justified on one ground, and on one ground alone. That ground was that British settlers in South Africa were not allowed to have a say in the election of representatives of the people. President Paul Kruger, in 1899, did what our modern—

Sir WILFRID LAURIER: Kruger.

Mr. SINCLAIR: —Paul Kruger of Portage la Prairie is attempting to do in 1917. Kruger denied to British subjects in South Africa the right to vote until they had been in the country a period of twelve years. In the year 1899 he introduced the Transvaal Franchise Act, which was on all fours with this measure. You would suppose from reading this Bill that the Secretary of State had obtained his inspiration from Kruger's Franchise Act; The only difference is that this Bill is more oppressive. Kruger required a residence of twelve years; this Bill requires a residence of fifteen years—indeed, eighteen years, because a man has to be three years in the country before he can take the oath of allegiance. The Transvaal Franchise Act denied to all citizens who were not burghers or Boers the right to vote. The enfranchised Englishmen, or Uitlander, as he was called, could become a burgher after twelve years' residence. The Government of Great Britain protested against this long period of probation. The Uitlanders themselves protested. There was great excitement in the Transvaal, in the Cape and in England. Great indignation was expressed at the injustice that had been perpetrated. Large meetings were held in the mining districts of South Africa; an immense delegation was appointed to wait on President Kruger. They put forward every possible argument; They appealed to him as a Christian and as a statesman and as a man. But he was immovable. The London Times published at the time the short, defiant speech that Kruger made on that occasion in reply to the delegation. It was as follows:

> Burghers, friends, thieves, murderers, newcomers, and others: Go back and tell your people that I shall never give them anything. I shall never change my policy; now let the storm burst.

Mr. McKENZIE: What does the Kruger from Manitoba say?

Mr. SINCLAIR: I am glad to say that the burghers were not all of one mind. A party in South Africa led by Joubert stood for moderation and fair play. In an eloquent speech, he opposed the Franchise measure.

He said:

> If you pass this you might as well obliterate from the arms of the republic the motto that unity makes strength.

But Kruger had his way; the law passed; the storm burst, and it broke against the shores of Canada. My right hon. leader who was at that time the Prime Minister of this country sent out a call to the young men of Canada, and 8,000 of them answered the call and went to that distant part of the Empire to fight for the flag. Some of them never came back. At Paardeburg, the Modder river and other places on the lonely veldt of South Africa you will today see little wooden crosses marking the graves of some 200 Canadians who perished in that struggle. They gave their lives in defence of the principles for which we stand here to-day. Did they throw away their lives? Will any man say that those men died in vain? I make the statement, Mr. Speaker, without fear of successful contradiction, that this Bill is a direct insult to their memories. This House of Commons at that time, by a solemn resolution, unanimously condemned in anticipation the attitude of hon. gentlemen opposite. This resolution, which was moved by Sir Wilfrid Laurier, seconded by Mr. Foster and unanimously adopted, read:

> 1. Resolved, that this House has viewed with regret the complications which have arisen in the Transvaal Republic, of which Her Majesty is suzerain, from the refusal to accord to Her Majesty's subjects now settled in that region, any adequate participation in its government;
>
> 2. Resolved, that this House has learned with still greater regret that the condition of things there existing has resulted in intolerable oppression, and has produced great and dangerous excitement among several classes of Her Majesty's subjects in her South African possessions;
>
> 3. Resolved, that this House, representing a people which has largely succeeded, by the adoption of the principle of conceding equal political rights to every portion of the population, in harmonizing estrangements and in producing general content with the existing system of government, desires to express its sympathy with the efforts of Her Majesty's Imperial authorities to obtain for the subjects of

Her Majesty who have taken up their abode in the Transvaal such measures of justice and political recognition as may be found necessary to secure them in the full possession of equal rights and liberties.

The members of the House stood up and gave three cheers and passed this resolution unanimously and sang God save the King.

Sir Charles Tupper who was at that time leader of the Opposition wrote a letter giving his assent to the resolution. My right hon. leader made a speech in which I find this extract:

We can appeal for protection to the Uitlanders in the Transvaal, not only upon the grounds of British citizenship and suzerainty, but upon rights which must appeal to the conscience of all men. If there is any country in the world it is this country of ours, Canada, where we can proclaim this principle, that wherever men of different races, but races of equal rank, are found to live together under the same Government, the only policy which can give adequate justice to all, which can give satisfaction to all, which can insure harmony, is a policy of equal rights and equal justice, a policy which will give to every citizen, without any question of birth or origin, the same rights, the same liberties, the same privileges, the same aspirations. This is the policy which we have adopted in this country, and I think we can fairly claim with some pride, that it has proved eminently successful.

Now let me read this short extract from the speech of the present Minister of Trade and Commerce (Sir George Foster):

Nothing strikes us more strongly than the attempt—which may be based on grounds of self-preservation and limited patriotism—of President Kruger to keep for himself and the Dutch citizens of that republic the rights, the privileges, the power which they have hitherto had. But every one sees that it is a contest which can have only one termination; that to-day the civilized world is hostile to such a policy as that; and that all that is required, as I believe, is a continuation of that patience and the focussing of the attention of the civilized world upon that point to bring about an amicable solution in the end. Great Britain's efforts have always been marked by the free giving of equal rights to men of every nationality who choose to become citizens of her own country or of any of her dependencies.

The Prime Minister himself was at that time a member of this House, and although the record does not say so, I presume he stood up and voted for that resolution and sang God Save the King.

One thing that I am proud of is this, namely, that my honoured leader, after eighteen years of change, worry and the turmoil of a stormy public career, is standing to-day for the same high principles of freedom, fair play and justice for which he stood in 1899. What about hon. gentlemen opposite? Where does the Minister of Trade and Commerce stand? I feel sure that my right hon. friend, if left to his better judgment, would repudiate this measure. There is not the slightest doubt that he would like to do so. The spirit, I have no doubt, is willing, but the flesh, I am afraid, is weak. In 1899 he declared that the civilized world was hostile to such a policy as this, but the civilized world, and all its works, must be ignored when it conflicts with the re-election of the Tory party. That is all thrown to the winds now. My right hon. friend's good intentions of 1899, I fear, have become another paving stone in the road to that place that I would not care to mention. The trouble with the Government is that they are stampeded for fear of defeat in the coming election. They have grown chicken-hearted. They are grasping at every straw within their reach. They are afraid to face their opponents in a fair fight. The Canadian soldier exhibits no such craven spirit. Can any one imagine a Canadian soldier making plans to disarm his antagonist and hamstring him—

Mr. SPEAKER: Order.

Mr. SINCLAIR: —and bind him hand and foot before venturing to attack him?

Mr. SPEAKER: Order. The hon. gentleman's time has fully expired.

Mr. J. W. EDWARDS (Frontenac): Mr. Speaker, it is not my intention to occupy more than a very few minutes in regard to the question now before the House. This matter divides itself into two parts, namely, the giving of the franchise to certain women in the country and the disfranchising of certain men in the country. I do not agree with the hon. member for Guysborough (Mr. Sinclair) when he says that this Bill disfranchises one million women in this country. We cannot disfranchise those who do not possess the franchise. We cannot take away from them that which they do not possess. Therefore, I say that his remark in that regard is entirely erroneous. The hon. gentleman saw fit to draw attention in his remarks to the fact that the vote was being given to certain men who, he said never lived in Canada and perhaps never will live in Canada. In that, he referred to those British subjects, who, living in the United States, saw fit to don the uniform and go overseas to fight in this great war in our behalf. I think the hon. gentleman's opposition to the extension of the franchise to those men will not be received with acclaim by many people in this country. Even in his own constituency, I doubt very

much if he will find many to agree with him in his opposition to the granting of the franchise to those brave men who have gone overseas to do for us what a number of people in this country have shown no disposition to do for themselves. The hon. gentleman has referred to Krugerism, Kaiserism, Prussianism and the Boer war. He was very strong in his expression of disapproval of Krugerism. Might I remind the hon. member that his attitude to-day is somewhat different from the attitude of his party at the time Kruger defied Britain in South Africa? The attitude of his party at that time was one of standing still until the sentiment of this country forced them to take action, and it was only under that compulsion that they sent some troops to South Africa to put down Krugerism, and even then they sent them on the C.O.D. principle. The hon. gentleman says that the men who gave their lives in South Africa died for principles for which they on that side of the House stand. He might have added to that that they died for the principles for which we on this side of the House move. That is the distinction between the two parties: They "stand" and we "move." They stood in the matter of the war in South Africa until the people made them move. They have stood in the matter of this war; and so far as they are concerned, if we are to judge from their present attitude, there would have been very few Canadians overseas, had hon. gentlemen opposite been in power in this country instead of the party which is in power.

As to the granting of votes to women, might I remind hon. gentlemen opposite of what took place in this House away back in 1895, when Mr. Davin, then member for Assiniboia, moved, on the 8th of May:

> That in the opinion of this House, the privilege of voting for candidates for membership thereof should be extended to women possessing the qualifications which now entitle men to the electoral franchise.

That motion was opposed by the right hon. gentleman who now leads the Opposition, who moved in amendment that:

> The question of woman suffrage is one which, like other questions concerning the suffrage, more properly belongs to provincial jurisdiction.

In other words, he shifted the whole responsibility to the provinces, and raised the issue whether there should be a provincial or Dominion franchise for Federal purposes. In the course of his remarks on that occasion, he said that so far as the province of Quebec was concerned, there was no sentiment in favour of granting the franchise to women; the sentiment, on the contrary, was just the other way. He said:

> I am not sure that the granting of the franchise to women would be altogether an unmixed evil. I am not sure that it would tend to the harmony or to the improvement of domestic life which after all is the proper centre of woman's influence. . . . Whether the suffrage is applied to women or to any other class, it is largely a question of education, largely a question of social disposition, largely a question of habit. Let the provinces decide the question. There may be provinces where from the education of the people, from their social habits, it might be conducive to the general good of the country that women should be admitted to the franchise. As to the province from which I come, I must say that it is not prepared for woman suffrage. . . . If the proposition were made in the local Legislature of Quebec to confer the suffrage on women, I am quite sure it would be voted down at once. Speaking for the province of Quebec, I am certainly right in saying that women do not feel it an injustice that they have no right to vote on any political question.

If, therefore, this Bill went the length the hon. member for Guysborough says it should go, and granted the franchise to all women, it would be disapproved of more heartily by the right hon. gentleman who now leads the Opposition than if it granted only a partial franchise to women. In other words, if all the women of the province of Quebec and other provinces were to be enfranchised, instead of only some of them, as under this Bill, the grievance of that province, if it is a grievance at all, would certainly be much greater.

This measure proposes to give to certain women in this country a voice in the selecting of the next Government of this Dominion. Why should the franchise be extended to these particular women, rather than to all women in this country? Will any person say that the women who have worked for the Red Cross and other patriotic societies, making comforts for the soldiers, should be put on the same footing, even though some of them have worked night and day almost, with the women whose relatives are overseas? I believe there will be no outcry from these women themselves, because their sisters whose relatives are overseas are to be given the right to vote.

But there is another reason why these women whose husbands and sons and brothers are overseas should be selected for this honour on this occasion. They have an especial interest in the selecting of the next Government which will control the destinies of this country for the next four or five years. They have an especial in-

terest in seeing that the honour their men have won for this country is not put to shame by a Government which would be controlled by the anti-British and foreign element in this Dominion. That, I say, is their right on this occasion. What injustice is being done to the foreign element, the alien enemies in this country, in excluding them from the franchise? One can understand that men of Austrian or German birth might feel very diffident about enlisting and going to the front, possibly to fight against their own cousins and brothers in this great struggle. But if these men of alien enemy birth are not prepared to assume their full share of responsibility as citizens of this country, they certainly should not ask for all the privileges that go with citizenship in this country. Citizenship is not a one-sided affair. It grants certain privileges to a man, but it also entails the assumption of certain responsibilities, and it seems to me that in view of the struggle that is going on in Europe at the present time, no injustice is being done to those men who have so far shown little or no disposition to take part in that great struggle, by excluding them from the franchise. What right have men to call out in the name of liberty, who have made no effort to maintain that liberty? What right have men to call out in the name of democracy and democratic government who are not prepared to fight to maintain democratic government and democratic principles? What injustice is being done to any man who has shown no disposition to uphold the principles of democracy on which the government of this country is founded, by refusing him a say in the election of a government in this democratic country?

The next election will be entirely different from any other election ever held in this country. There will be no fiscal issue before the people. The only issue will be: Shall we place in power in the Dominion of Canada for the next four or five years a government that is in sympathy with British institutions and prepared to keep faith with the boys who have gone overseas, or a government chosen from a party who have shown by their conduct that they are not in sympathy with British institutions, and that they are not prepared to keep faith with the boys overseas and back them up with the reserves that are required? That is the question for the people of Canada to decide in the next election. It will not be a question of tariff or of fiscal policy. The question will be: Shall this country be controlled for the next four or five years by men who are in sympathy with British institutions and democratic principles and prepared to do their part in maintaining them, or shall it be controlled by men backed up by the anti-British and foreign element in this country who so far have shown, not only no disposition to maintain the principles which hon. gentlemen opposite so loudly acclaim in this Chamber, but in many cases have shown a disposition to block all progress along the line of maintaining those principles as they should be maintained, and a disposition not to back up our men at the front. Therefore, for these reason, I give my hearty support to this measure.

[Mr. Edwards.]

Right Hon. Sir WILFRED LAURIER: Mr. Speaker, in all federated countries it was for a long time a much discussed question as to what power should regulate the franchise. Two ideas were advanced, one that the franchise should be regulated by each legislative body, whether it was the local body or the central body. The other that there should be only one franchise, as there was only one country to be represented, and what division there was, was not in the people but in the nature of the power which was entrusted either to the local body or to the central body. After long discussion, the prevailing idea was that there should be only one franchise, and that whether the people were represented in the local legislatures or in the central Parliament it should be only the same electorate that should act. The American constitution, indeed, on this point is very definite. The second article reads:

> The House of Representatives shall be composed of members chosen every second year by the people of the several states, and the electors in each state shall have the qualifications requisite for electors of the most numerous branch of the State Legislature.

So, in the United States, the franchise is regulated by each of the 45 States of the Union. There is no franchise for Congress, but the members of the Congress are elected by this franchise which exists in the several states of the Union. Our Constitution did not go that far, but it provided, by article 41, that until the Parliament of Canada had otherwise legislated, the franchise as it existed in the year 1867 in each one of the provinces, should be the franchise upon which the House of Commons would be elected. That state of thing continued until the year 1885,

4 p.m. when this Parliament enacted a franchise for itself, which fran-

chise existed until the year 1897; and I ask the judgment of every man in this House, either on this side or on the other side, as to whether the Dominion franchise which existed from 1885 to 1897 ever gave the same satisfaction as the provincial franchises had given before the year 1885. From the year 1897 up to the present time, the franchise for this Federal House has been the provincial franchise, and I think I may say, again placing myself under the judgment of every man in this House, that the provincial franchise has given full satisfaction.

If I understood aright the speech delivered by the Secretary of State the other day, when he moved the second reading of this Bill—and I think I did understand it aright—he rather agreed with the principle of maintaining the provincial franchises for election to this House of Commons. But though he agreed in principle that the members of this House should be elected under the franchises in each province, he proceeded to stab the provincial franchises in three particulars.

In the first place the franchise which exists in the provinces of Alberta, Saskatchewan, Manitoba, and British Columbia, make no distinction at all between class and class—it gives the franchise to every British subject. My hon. friend by this Bill, however, provides that an important class of His Majesty's subjects shall be denied the privilege which they are now enjoying in each of those provinces.

Mr. MEIGHEN: Will my right hon. friend permit me? I know he does not wish to mis-state the case. It is not at all true that the provincial franchise laws in the West make no distinction of race, and that all British subjects have the right to vote. As a matter of fact, they do make distinctions of race, and all British subjects have not the right to vote.

Sir WILFRID LAURIER: In Manitoba, there is no distinction whatever. Every man who is a British subject is a voter. If that is not the case, what is the use of this Bill? Why does it provide that British subjects, who have become British subjects after the 31st day of March, 1902, shall no longer be electors after this Bill becomes law? That is one thing to which I object.

Some hon. MEMBERS: Order.

Mr. MEIGHEN: In the province of Saskatchewan, Chinese subjects have not the right to vote.

Sir WILFRID LAURIER: If my hon. friend will permit me I will say: that is very specious reasoning. Chinese and Japanese are not voters, but the Germans and Austrians are voters, and they have been voters from the time they were naturalized. The object of my hon. friend is to take away from these men of foreign origin the rights and privileges of British subjects, which have been freely granted to them by the provinces I have mentioned.

That is what I blame my hon. friend for to-day. He is introducing a new principle and violating the franchise granted by his own province of Manitoba to these men. And, for what reason? Because, forsooth, they are of foreign origin. Because they may have been born in Germany, or Austria, or Turkey, they are not supposed to be able to give an unbiased verdict upon the questions before the country. Well, for my part, and I speak frankly, I do not admit that doctrine. I do not admit the doctrine that when a man leaves Europe—whatever may be the part of Europe whence he comes—and comes to this country, when he swears allegiance to His Majesty the King, when he becomes a citizen of Canada, when he builds a home for himself and for his family, I am not prepared to believe that if a conflict arises between the land of that man's birth and the land of his adoption, that he will go back upon the country to which he as sworn allegiance.

I can well believe that if there be men of German origin who have forsaken Germany and who have become British subjects in this country—having made their homes here and established their families here—that they may be suffering agony at this time, but I am not prepared to believe that they will turn traitor to the land of their adoption in favour of the land of their birth. They have given up the land of their birth because conditions were not satisfactory to them, because they were living under tyranny, because their Government would not respect its pledges; and they came to a land which they were taught and were told would hold sacred whatever promises or pledges it made to them. If you tell me that in a conflict between Germany and Great Britain these men will turn traitor to the land in which they have enjoyed freedom and happiness, I am not prepared to believe it. There may be cases here and there of men who will do so, but that the great mass of such people would, is something I do not believe. The men who came to Canada from Germany are very few. The great bulk of immigration did not come from the Empire of Germany. There are some German settlers in the

western provinces who have come since March 31, 1902, and I have never heard a single word in this Parliament or outside of it to say that they have not behaved as true British citizens.

Not only that, but for every German settler in Canada to-day there are in the United States one hundred, one thousand, settlers of German origin. Do we hear that in the United States they have taken this drastic, this humiliating course, which we are now asked to take by this legislation? No. The American Government, to their honour be it said, have trusted every man who has sworn allegiance to American institutions. It is reserved for this Parliament to be asked to deny everything which up to this time has been held sacred, that is to say, the honour of the British Crown given to these men, the promise made to them, every one of them, that they would be respected in all the privileges of a British subject. My hon. friend who preceded me quoted to-day the oath which is taken by every foreigner who becomes a British subject. Let me quote the pledge which is given on behalf of His Majesty the King:

> This is therefore to certify to all whom it may concern, that under and by virtue of the said Act so and so who has become naturalized as a British subject, and is, within Canada, entitled to all political and other rights, powers and privileges, and subject to all obligations to which a natural-born British subject is entitled or subject.

This is the pledge which was given to these men, whoever they may be, who have become naturalized since the 31st of March, 1902, and to-day we are asked to violate that pledge, to repudiate it, and to set it at nought. Well, Sir, that is not the way I understood British institutions. I heard a moment ago that we on this side are not proper British subjects, and have not the spirit of British institutions. I have only to say on this point that I claim that I understand and appreciate my liberties and my privileges as a British subject much better than many men who sit on the other side of the House.

And who are those who are to be disfranchised under this Act? Are they of German origin? Yes, a few of them who can be counted perhaps on the fingers of my two hands? These men who are to be disfranchised under this Bill are not Germans, but are those who have come to this country from Austria. Few are of German origin. Most of them are Slavs—Moravians, Galicians, Ruthenians and Bukowinians, all men of Slav origin who have for years and

centuries been tossed about in their allegiance, now to the Turks, now to the Austrians, and who, to-day are Austrians by force of law, but whose heart is not with the Empire of Austria. These men are rather looking towards Russia in the hope, perhaps, not that they will become Russians, but that their States will become independent. These men are not Germans, and the principles of the Bill as expounded by the Secretary of State (Mr. Meighen) do not apply to them.

It is said that these men, on account of their origin or their allegiance, are not supposed to be able to give a fair verdict upon the issues before the Canadian people. I say, on the contrary, that these men, by their allegiance, are in full sympathy with the cause for which we have been fighting for the last three years. The object of this Bill, therefore, is not to be found in the speech of the Secretary of State—there is something behind it all. I repeat that if my right hon. friend the Prime Minister were to trust to these men in the same way as they have been trusted in every election since they came to this country, he would find that upon all the issues which are now pending before the Canadian people, their hearts are in full sympathy with the cause of freedom which we are defending in this war.

But there is something else. My right hon. friend is not satisfied with taking away the franchise from those British subjects by naturalization; he equally takes away the franchise from the women of Canada in five provinces. I heard a moment ago the hon. member for Frontenac (Mr. Edwards) say that we took away no rights from the women of Canada. The law to-day, and the condition that exists, is that in five of the provinces of this Dominion, by Acts passed by the local legislatures in the full enjoyment of their provincial rights, the women have been enfranchised and have a right to vote. These are the provinces of Ontario, Manitoba, Saskatchewan, Alberta and British Columbia, and, according to the law which I shall read to my right hon. friend, these women to-day have the right to vote in Dominion elections. Here is the law (revised statutes of Canada, chapter 6, section 10):

> The qualifications necessary to entitle any person to vote at a Dominion election in any province shall, except as herein otherwise provided, be those established by the laws of that province as necessary to entitle such persons to vote in the same part of the province at a provincial election.

According to my interpretation of this law, the women of Ontario, the women of

Manitoba who are to-day on the electoral lists, have a right to vote in Dominion elections. I know that this point is controverted. The Minister of Justice (Mr. Doherty), on a previous occasion, speaking on this subject, expressed the opinion that this provision did not give the women of those provinces the right to vote in a federal election. I cannot, for my part, admit this interpretation. I have nothing to say in disparagement of the legal ability of the Minister of Justice; on the contrary. I have nothing but praise for it. But the best men can err, and it seems to me, that with the law as it is to-day, it is impossible to maintain any other opinion than that the women in any province where they have the right to vote in the provincial elections have also the right to vote for members of the House of Commons. But I have to say more than this, and this is my answer to the hon. member for Frontenac: If the women of those provinces have not, by the existing Dominion law, the right to vote in the coming election for the House of Commons, it will be the duty of the House of Commons to give them that right.

This Bill is based upon one idea, so far as it is not a negative idea, that is to give to the women who happen to be relatives of soldiers who have enlisted, the right of the franchise to a certain degree. To this I have no objection. But there is a better way of doing it than that chosen by the Government, who have given the franchise only to certain women. The only proper way would be to give it to all women. I am told that there is a special degree of merit in the women who happen to have relatives at the front, that they are better entitled to the franchise than those who have not relatives there.

Is that principle to be accepted? Are we to weigh their actions, in order to ascertain who among them may have more or less merit? I am willing to give them all the credit which is due to them, but there are thousands and thousands of women who may have no relatives at the front, but who have done all that it was possible for them to do, to help the allied cause. Where is the town or village in Canada where the women have not done the very best in their power to assist the Allies in this war? They have worked by night and by day to minister to the wants of the soldiers at the front who are fighting our battles. The only thing they have not done is this: they have not gone to the trenches, but they have gone as near to the trenches as it was possible for them to go. Many of them have ventured far, in order to render assistance and comforts to those who have been wounded on the battlefield, and will you tell me that those, though they may not have relatives at the front, should not have the same rights and privileges as those who may have a brother or a member of their family fighting for the Empire? For all these reasons, Sir, I say that the measure which has been presented to us is one which cannot be accepted by a free parliament.

We are in favour of advancing, and not in favour of retrograding. If it be thought advisable to extend the franchise to those women who have relatives at the front, should we not give it to all women in this country who have done their part in assisting in the cause. Let not this franchise be extended in the manner proposed, at the expense of removing it from those who have it already. Let that not be done at the expense of removing the franchise from those who now have it. Let it not be done by depriving any of our people of rights and privileges which have always been held sacred under the British constitution.

Sir, in this war, we are giving generously of our money, and, indeed, we have been piling up an expenditure which would become very dangerous were it not for the vast resources of this country. But for my part, at the present time I have not been disturbed by this, because I have full confidence in the resources of the Canadian people. Sir, it must be remembered that the resources of our country are of no avail unless we have men to exploit them, and if we are to bear the load which is being imposed upon us, simply with the present population, the problem is one which may well cause any man to pause. We want more people, we want more help and more assistance, and where are we to get it? Do you believe, Sir, that when the war is over, when peace is restored, and when we come to normal life, when we shall send our immigration agents to Europe again, as we did before, to bring immigrants to this country, that we can send them to the Balkans? If we cannot send them to the Balkans, where shall we send them? Can we expect a large immigration from the British Isles? I am afraid it is not to be expected. We cannot expect any immigration from France or Belgium. Our field will be mostly in the Balkans. Do you believe that when our Canadian immigration agents will go to the Balkan States, among the

Galicians, Bukowinians, and Rumanians, that these different races will be disposed to come to this country, when they know that Canada has not kept its pledges and promises to the people from foreign countries who have settled in our midst, and when they know that in the United States there was never any attempt to curtail or interfere with the rights as American citizens which immigrants to that country were granted. It seems to me that in this condition of things there is a thought which will make Parliament pause before proceeding further with this Bill. This is not a Liberal measure, it is not a Canadian measure, and it is not a British measure. It is a retrograde measure and a German measure. The position taken by the Government cannot be justified. If you want to have the true intent and meaning of this Bill, you must go beyond the Bill itself, because within the four corners of the Bill there is no justification which could induce any man on the other side of the House to vote for it For my part I hope that it is not too late to ask Parliament to pause, and to consider the bad precedent which it is establishing, which must be far-reaching in its consequences. I ask my hon. friend to reflect upon this. The measure is such that it must have serious consequence. If it be said in Canada that the pledges which we have given to immigrants when inviting them to come to this country to settle with us, can be broken with impunity, that we will not trust these men, and that we will not be true to the promises which we made to them, then I despair of the future of this country. I could not expect that in future we shall have the same measure of satisfaction that we have had in the past in our efforts to induce immigration, if we follow such a principle.

I again call to the attention of my hon. friends on the other side the comparison which will be made between the treatment which is accorded to immigrants in the United States, and the treatment which is accorded them by the Canadian authorities. Look at the action of the American Congress, when that country came into the war. The Congress made more preparation for war in six months than we did perhaps, in three years. They looked over the whole field and covered it, but they never thought of disfranchising anybody, even when the country was overrun by German spies, when German spies were engaged in treachery and trickery, when they were trying to dislocate even the production of munitions. When such were to be found everywhere and anywhere, the American Congress did not, for a single moment, think of depriving the German settler of the rights and privileges which he had received as an American citizen. Is that not the course which we ourselves should pursue? Should we not follow the example of the United States in this regard, rather than introduce legislation of such a retrograde character as this?

I am sorry to have to take the position which I have taken on this point. I have been supporting the Government on the war policy up to the present session. I am sorry that the occasion arose during this session when I had to discontinue my support of the Government on a measure of great importance. I am sorry that I have to again dissent with the Government on this measure. But I believe—and we shall all be judged some day by our actions here—that in this instance the Government is taking a step which will cause serious injury to the country, and, therefore, Sir, actuated by these sentiments I beg to move:

That this Bill be not now read a second time but that it be resolved that the abridgment by this Parliament of the electoral franchise now enjoyed in any province of the Dominion by any class of His Majesty's subjects would be contrary to the peace, order, and good government of Canada.

Right Hon. Sir ROBERT BORDEN (Prime Minister): Mr. Speaker, in the limited time at my disposal I shall not be able to follow my right hon. friend (Sir Wilfrid Laurier) in all that he has said. It may, however, be worth while to point out that he is seriously astray in some of his assertions. It is not true, although he asserted that it was, that all naturalized British subjects in the four western provinces have the right to vote; that can be demonstrated to him by the production of the provincial statutes bearing upon the question. He seemed to be under the impression, also, that women who have gone overseas as nurses with the Canadian Expeditionary Forces have not the right to vote. He emphasized this by declaring that in some cases they have been under fire. I beg to assure him that all members of the Canadian Expeditionary Force, whether men or women, have the right to vote at the forthcoming election. Not only is that the case, but, as I am reminded by the Secretary of State (Hon. Arthur Meighen), the female relatives in this country of such women also have the right to vote at the election to be held in the early future.

My right hon. friend has taken issue with the opinion of the law officers of the Crown

as to the construction of the Dominion Elections Act. He asserts that all women on the provincial lists have the right to vote at Dominion elections. I can only say to him that the Minister of Justice (Hon. C. J. Doherty), the Solicitor General, and all the legal authorities whom the Government consulted on this question, entertain an opinion directly opposite to that for which my right hon. friend stands sponsor. He will realize that under the circumstances we are bound to take the opinion of the law officers of the Crown, and of other eminent legal authorities to whom I have alluded, rather than his own.

My right hon. friend has called to his aid the example of the United States. No federal election has been held in the United States since that country became a belligerent; therefore he has nothing to offer to us from the example of the United States. Nor can he offer anything to us from the example of the United States until he is able to point to their action under conditions similar to those which confront this country at present. He omitted altogether in his statement any reference to the well known fact that Australia has given us an example of legislation of precisely the same character as this, except that here we have not gone as far as Australia has.

My right hon. friend has seen fit, for what reason I do not know, to disparage this country by stating that the United States have done more in four or five months—I suppose he meant proportionately—than this country has done in three years. I desire to take the most emphatic issue with my right hon. friend on that point. I do not understand the motive which led him to make such an assertion, having regard to his responsibility as a public man and to the position that he occupies in this House and in this country. I desire to draw no comparisons. I fully realize the splendid effort that the United States is making in this war; I have heard many accounts of it in recent days. There is no doubt about the fact that they are making a magnificent effort; they are going into the war in a splendid, whole-hearted way, with a view to achieving the victory which we all desire. But I should like to tell my hon. friend—if he does not know it, he ought to know it—that if the United States had made proportionately the same effort in this war that Canada made in the first two months after the war broke out in 1914, she would have raised within six weeks after she entered the war an army of 500,000 men, and within two months she would have had that army on the ocean en route to France.

With regard to the whole question, I should like my right hon. friend to realize that this is a war-time election which he has forced on this country. So far as the disqualification of aliens of enemy nationality is concerned, there are some considerations that he has not taken into account. Does my right hon. friend seriously propose that we should put aliens of enemy nationality under the Military Service Act and send them to the front line of trenches in France and Flanders to fight men of their own kin, men of their own blood, men, perhaps, with whom they were brought up in the days gone by? If my right hon. friend says that we should call upon them to pronounce judgment upon the issue of this war in this election, will he shrink from declaring that they ought to be subject to the same military service as other citizens of Canada? If he takes the one position, it seems to me that he must take the other. He has taken care, however, not to put that forward, for reasons which are very obvious. It would be unnatural to send these men to the front to fight those of their own flesh and blood. Indeed, it would be cruel to do so, because the naturalization which they have obtained in Canada does not follow them after they leave the limits of this country, and if they were sent to the front line trenches and were captured by the German or Austrian troops, they might be shot. Would any man say that under those circumstances we should force these men into combatant military service; that we should send them into the front line of battle to fight against their own flesh and blood? Moreover, if we were disposed to take that extraordinary course, what result would follow? The military authorities at the front would not permit us to do so. I have not one word to say against the loyalty to Canada of these men. Throughout this war they have conducted themselves, on the whole, in a reasonable and orderly manner. But no one can doubt that the ties of blood mean something to them, as they do to us. No one can doubt that these men do have a certain sympathy with those of their own kin who are fighting against our troops in the trenches beyond the seas. While on the whole there might not be the danger which is apprehended by the military authorities, who would undertake to say that in some individual instance a man's intense sym-

pathy for his own flesh and blood might not overcome his loyalty to his adopted country? If that occurred in one, two, or three instances, what would be the result? If my right hon. friend had seen some of the telegrams that I have read in regard to what happened to some of the New Zealand troops overseas eighteen months ago, he would, perhaps, realize that considerations of this kind are entitled to more weight than he has been disposed to give them.

If I have made good my point that it is absolutely impracticable for us to force these men into combatant service, to send them into the front line trenches to fight against their own flesh and blood, what follows? What is to be the issue in this election? The issue in this election is to be upon Canada's part in this war, upon the necessity of sending reinforcements to our men overseas who are holding there the first battle line of Canada. The question is as to maintaining Canada's effort. If these citizens, by their origin, by their early environment, by the ties of kinship, by their natural sympathies, cannot be forced into the front line to fight, for precisely the same reason they ought not to be called upon to pronounce judgment upon the issues which will be to the fore in this election. They do not want to be forced into combatant service; more than that, I have reason to believe, from statements that have come to me from most reliable sources, that a large number of these men will be grateful for exemption from compulsory military service on the one hand and for not being called upon to pronounce their judgment in this election on the other. For the same reason that they do not wish to be sent to the front line to fight against their own kindred, they do not wish to be forced into the disagreeable alternative of pronouncing a judgment in which, on the one hand, there is a question of their devotion to their adopted country and to its national purposes, and on the other hand, there is the force of ties of kinship and sympathy towards those who are fighting against us. These considerations apply equally to German-speaking citizens from Russia, whose origin, kinship and sympathies are subject to the same observations, although technically they were citizens of an Allied nation.

My right hon. friend has developed a very deep and sudden sympathy for granting the franchise to the women of this country. I had understood, even until the middle of the present session, that my right hon. friend was not very sympathetic to that proposal, and that some of his followers had much difficulty in persuading my right hon. friend that he should come to their view. He starts out on the assumption that the women of Ontario, Manitoba, Saskatchewan, Alberta and British Columbia are entitled to vote at federal elections. I take direct issue with him on that point. I say they are not entitled, under the present law, to vote at federal elections. Therefore, when my right hon. friend argues that we are depriving those women of a vote to which they are presently entitled, he is speaking without the book, if we rely, as we are entitled to rely, upon the opinions of the law officers of the Crown and of all authorities whom we have consulted on that question. I should further like to point out to my right hon. friend and to those on the other side of the House that the question of conferring the franchise on all the women of Canada is surrounded with certain difficulties and complexities which, in my judgment, cannot be solved within the four remaining weeks which comprise the lifetime of this Parliament. In receiving the franchise, women assume an equal status with men in directing and controlling the Government of this country. That is the logical and inevitable consequence of their gradual emancipation from the days when the personality of a woman was absolutely merged in that of her husband, and when women were regarded as not entitled to any voice either in the affairs of the country, or even with regard to their own property. They were denied the right to make contracts. They were not looked upon in the same light as were men in the direction of the affairs of the State, or even in the direction of their own personal affairs. We have emerged from all that. We are emerging now to the point at which the women of this country must be entitled to the same voice in directing the affairs of the country as men, and so far as I am concerned, I commit myself absolutely to that proposal: But I say, that in working it out, it is necessary to take into account certain considerations. I happen to know that the women of this country themselves are very much alive to those considerations. The consideration is this: that the citizenship of a married woman is not dependent, under the law of this country, upon any individual application on her behalf for naturalization, but her citizenship—with one trifling exception which became law for the first time in 1914—is dependent upon the citizen-

ship of her husband. The result of that is this: After the 1st day of January next no man is entitled to naturalization in this country unless he shall have resided in this country for five years. The law up to the present time has required a residence of three years. But if a woman from the Balkan states or elsewhere comes into this country, and after a three weeks' or three months' residence, marries a man who is a native-born or naturalized British subject, she at once becomes a British subject herself. Therefore, unless some safeguard is provided, the alien woman who marries a native-born or naturalized British subject would become entitled to the franchise with no residence at all, or with a residence very far short of that required of men. Every hon. gentleman will realize that such a result would require pretty careful examination and study by Parliament. I say again that the women of this country are very much alive to that consideration, and delegations of women from both East and West have pressed it upon my attention. What is the remedy for that condition? The remedy, it seems to me, is this: If a woman is to have an equal status with a man in the franchise and in determining the direction of public affairs in this country, is it not reasonable that a woman shall have an equal voice in determining what her citizenship shall be? If she is entitled to a full voice in the direction of public affairs she is entitled to an equally full voice in deciding what her citizenship shall be. What is the law at the present time? A woman who has resided in Canada all her life marries an alien in this country, and what happens? She loses her British citizenship. That is not a fair result if we are to grant the franchise to women. Suppose we should grant the franchise to all the women of Canada to-morrow and leave the naturalization law as it is at present. Then any British-born woman, any woman born within the limits of this Empire, resident in Canada, who might marry an alien, would immediately lose her right to vote because her citizenship would become the citizenship of her husband. Therefore, we must consider the provisions of the naturalization law, and we must give to alien women who come into Canada a right to individual naturalization, which they cannot have under the law as it is to-day.

My right hon. friend will say: Why not do that at the present session? I say: It is impossible, in view of the brevity of the time remaining at our disposal, to give that question the attention and to surround the measure with the safeguards necessary for that purpose. Let us remember that in 1914 a very earnest, and, I think, an effective attempt was made for two purposes. One was to have a uniform naturalization law passed in the Mother Country and in every great Dominion of the Empire. The other was to increase the length of residence in various Dominions of the Empire for the purpose of naturalization and to make such naturalization effective throughout the Empire. The law which was passed in 1914 in Great Britain was passed by this Parliament as well. It was passed, also, by the legislature of the colony of Newfoundland. I am not sure whether it was enacted in any of the other self-governing Dominions. I think it was passed by one other, but I am not certain. It is not apparent that if we are to amend our naturalization law, as seems to be necessary, in order that women may have the right individually to determine their citizenship, we must have some negotiation, we must give careful consideration to the purpose of uniformity which inspired the Imperial Conference of 1911, to take steps along this line? We have a naturalization law which is in precisely the same terms as that in force in the British Islands and in Newfoundland, and possibly in some other Dominions. The purpose is to have that Naturalization Act uniform throughout the whole Empire and to make it effective throughout. It is impossible for us to accomplish the purpose which, I think, is necessary, and which, I believe, the women of Canada consider necessary, in the few weeks yet remaining in the life of this Parliament.

What have we done under the circumstances? We have determined that we shall give to all the women of Canada who have immediate relatives serving in the Canadian Expeditionary Force the right to a voice in this election. Who shall deny them that right? It is based upon precisely the same principle as that which guided this Parliament in determining the qualifications under the Military Voters' Act, because men to-day serving in the Canadian Expeditionary Force have a right to vote at the impending election who would not have that right if they had not joined that force. The principle upon which we have proceeded is, as the Secretary of State properly expressed it the other day, the principle of service and of sacrifice.

There are other and additional considerations. Three hundred thousand men of the best that Canada can produce have joined the Canadian Expeditionary Force and gone overseas to fight for our liberties and our institutions. Is any hon. gentleman in this House inclined to minimize the influence which those men could exert during the coming election if they were personally present in Canada? Is not some regard and some importance to be attached to that consideration? But there is more than that. It will depend entirely upon the military operations as to how many of these men will have the opportunity to vote, and it is beyond question that many thousands of them by reason of the service in which they are offering themselves for the supreme sacrifice will not have that opportunity. But there is more than that. Thirty thousand of them lie buried in France and Flanders, and is it not right that the immediate relatives of these men should have some voice to speak on their behalf when the issues at the next election come to be determined? There are also some thousands of them prisoners in Germany, undergoing hardship and privation, to whom it is impossible to give the opportunity to vote at the impending election. Is it not right that some one in this country should have the opportunity to speak on their behalf? There are thousands of these men in the British or allied forces who were residents of Canada and would have had the right to vote at the next election except for this war and the service they are giving. I deem it right that some person in this country should have the right to speak in their behalf.

I say that this proposal to extend the franchise to the immediate relatives of soldiers at the front is not only a fair and reasonable proposal, but I go further and say that it would be most unfair and unjust if some one did not have the right to speak on their behalf. These are the reasons and the considerations which have impelled the Government to propose this measure to Parliament. The voice of those who are serving Canada overseas, of those who have fallen, of those who have died in order that Canada might live, of those who lie in German prisons, that voice we are endeavouring to preserve and give effect to by this measure.

Mr. W. A. BUCHANAN (Medicine Hat): Mr. Speaker, I understand the Prime Minister to say that the introduction of this Bill was largely brought about by the refusal to extend the life of Parliament. I was one of those who voted against the extension of the life of this Parliament, and also one of those who voted in favour of the Military Service Act. I also represent a constituency where there are a number of people who belong to the nationalities that will be deprived of the franchise by this measure. When I voted for conscription, when I voted against the extension of the life of Parliament, I realized that I would have to face these people and explain my position. But I was satisfied and I am satisfied still that I could appeal to them and present reasons for the attitude I took and get their support. But now, with a measure of this character before the House, I cannot go to them and appeal for their support. I have appealed to them ever since this war commenced on behalf of the Patriotic Fund and other patriotic causes; I have explained to them why we are engaged in this war; I have pointed out to them that we were fighting for freedom, liberty and justice, fighting for the national honour and for the pledged word. Now I cannot go back to them and say: "I have urged you to support this cause and to be loyal to this country," and then defend a course that would mean that I, a member of this Parliament, had broken the pledged word of Canada to these people when they became citizens of this country. That is my position. I do not think it is fair for this Parliament to charge that every man of German or Austrian birth in this country is disloyal. I know men who are not of those nationalities; some of them are Canadian-born; yes, and some of them are British-born, and they have not displayed any great loyalty to this country or to our Allies since this war commenced. Why should they also not be deprived of the franchise?

I read a certain paper day in and day out, and have done so since this war commenced. It is the greatest exponent of the cause of the Allies on the American continent, if not in the whole world, and it is published by a man who was born in Germany; I refer to the New York Times. There is another paper published in the city of New York, the New York World, founded, I think, by a man of Austrian birth, and published to-day by his son, which is also an exponent of the cause of the Allies. And who did the President of the United States depend upon to carry his selective draft measure through the House of Representatives at Washington? When the Democratic leader in that body, a man,

I think, not of foreign birth at any rate, refused to promote that measure in the House of Representatives, the ranking Republican, a man of German extraction, if not a German-born, a Congressman from California, directed the measure through that House. And is it fair in this Parliament of Canada, where we maintain we are fighting for freedom, liberty and justice, and where we have given these people the rights of citizenship, that we should stamp upon every one of them who came to this country and became citizens since 1902 the mark of disloyalty, and say that they are not prepared to do their part as citizens of this country? I say, no.

This measure is largely directed against the people who are living in western Canada, against the people who have become citizens since 1902. The settlers of German birth in Ontario who came prior to that are left with the franchise. Now if I remember rightly there have been more expressions of disloyalty amongst some of these people in the province of Ontario than there have been throughout the whole West since this war commenced, and still you are leaving these people in Ontario and the older parts of eastern Canada with a vote, and taking away from the new settlers in western Canada the rights we guaranteed them as citizens. These people have been urged to remain loyal and respect our laws from the commencement of this war, and most of them have done so.

I publish a newspaper in the southern part of the province of Alberta. My ambition has been to create a national sentiment amongst all our new citizens. In my newspaper and during the opportunities I have had as a public man I have done all that I could to promote a virile Canadian sentiment. I was today looking over the report of the Commissioners of the Royal Northwest Mounted police for the year 1916, and in nearly every instance the officials connected with the Royal Northwest Mounted Police say they have had practically no trouble whatever with the foreign-born element in western Canada.

I was speaking at the commencement of my remarks of the attitude taken by myself as a western member on the question of conscription, but my position is far easier than that of many men from western Canada who voted for the Military Service Bill. Compared with some western members who voted for conscription, I have very few of the foreign element in my constituency. These hon. members knew they had these people in their constituencies, but they voted for conscription nevertheless. It was a very drastic war measure, but these men broke with their party and supported it, although they knew that back in their constituencies there were hundreds and thousands of foreign-born citizens. I would refer to the hon. member for Humboldt (Mr. Neely), the member for Saltcoats (Mr. MacNutt), and the members for many other constituencies, who are in a far different position from myself.

Still, this Government practically repudiates the independence of the western Liberal members who stood up for the Selective Military Measure in this House, and who broke with their party on that question, and they introduce a measure which practically says they have no confidence in many of our constituents. I want to say that hon. gentlemen on this side of the House who voted for this measure have confidence in their constituents, no matter to what race they may belong. So far as I am concerned, as a member of this House who supported conscription, if I am to go before my constituents again, I will tell them, whether they are foreign-born, Canadian-born or British-born, that I supported conscription because I thought it was right, and that they can only elect me on the understanding that I will continue to support conscription and maintain the law in force until the completion of the war. That is my position. The attitude the Government is taking at this time is most unfair, and it is a slap in the face to every western Liberal member who supported this Government on conscription.

We left our party and we took the position we did for the national advantage, because we looked upon the measure as a war measure. This Government is adopting the present measure not as a war measure and not for the national advantage, but for the advantage of the party they represent. I would like to say, that, if we are going to build up a united Canada, if we are going to bring people into this country and promise them the rights of citizenship, we must adhere to the pledged word we have given them. We must let them know that while we are fighting autocracy, while we are fighting a nation that broke its word to another nation, we as Canadians, living under the British flag, are going to adhere

to our word. If we trust these people, and if we let them understand the position of Canada and the position of the Allies, I think we can appeal to them and that they will stand loyally by us. Hundreds and thousands of them came away from their home countries because they objected to the form of Government, and because they were oppressed. Seeking relief, they came to Canada. They may not be anxious to support militarism of any kind in this country—as a matter of fact, many of them are opposed to war—but at the same time, many of them are opposed to the position taken in this war by the countries from which they came, and to the part those countries are taking in the war.

There is another feature of the Act to which I wish to refer briefly. The right to vote has been given to women, on the ground of war service or war sacrifice. I heartily approve of that feature of the Act, but I agree with many others who have spoken, from this side of the House at any rate, that war service or war sacrifice has not been confined solely to the women who allowed their loved ones to go across the sea and participate in the war, and probably sacrifice their lives for us. There are many women throughout the length and breadth of the country, in the cities, in the towns, in the villages, and in the farm homes, who have sacrificed much of their time, who have sewed and knitted and contributed for patriotic causes. In my judgment that element of our population should have been included in this Act, and they could very well have been included. If it is war service the Government is anxious to recognize, and if it is the friends of the Allies they want to recognize, why do not our friends from the province of British Columbia advocate that the franchise should be given to the Japanese and the Chinese there? They are our allies. They are fighting for us at the present time. If you are going to deprive a certain element of our population of their franchise—

5 p.m.

Mr. GLASS: Does my hon. friend recommend that the franchise should be given to the Japanese?

Some hon. MEMBERS: Order.

Mr. BUCHANAN: The Government would have as much right to do that as they have to disfranchise those citizens of Canada who took the oath of allegiance to this country, and who promised to be loyal and obedient citizens. If this were a question of war service, I believe, so far as the provisions relating to the franchise for women are concerned, the Government should have been more generous, and should have included all the war workers. What have we to say about those women who have been working in the munition factories since the war commenced? What have we to say about the young women who are giving their time driving automobile trucks around the city of Ottawa, for instance, for patriotic purposes? Are they not serving their country, and are they not making sacrifices? Why should they not be recognized? To my mind it is only absolutely fair that they should have recognition.

Certainly the next of kin of our soldiers have a right to be recognized, but it would have been a happy thing for this Parliament to have extended the privilege to every woman who has played her part as a patriotic citizen since the war started. I believe we can only create a proper spirit of unity throughout this country by placing trust in the people we have brought here and to whom we have given the rights of citizenship. We cannot create unity by looking upon them with suspicion, and by depriving them of the rights we guaranteed them when they became citizens, because in doing so we practically contradict the position we have taken as a participant in this war. We have always held the ground that Canada was in the war for great principles, one of which was respect for the pledged word and the maintenance of national honour. We cannot expect to have the loyal support of our citizens if we abandon that principle, and refuse to recognize our pledged word. I also object to the measure because it does not give a sufficiently broad franchise to the women of this country, and I will oppose it on those grounds.

Hon. ARTHUR MEIGHEN (Secretary of State): There is a disposition on the part of opponents of this measure to describe it as a disfranchisement measure, and to ascribe to it peculiarities which they seem to think are traditional with the Tory party. It is no disfranchisement measure, except in a very small and limited sense. On the contrary its enfranchisement features so far transcend its disfranchisement features that, taken in all, it is in comparison to our population, the widest extension of the franchise ever passed by a British community.

The hon. member who has just sat down (Mr. Buchanan), for the sincerity of whose opinions I have the most profound respect, appears to be labouring

under the apprehension that in this measure there is some rebuke to those hon. gentlemen opposite who supported the Government on the question of conscription. For the life of me I do not understand by what process of reasoning he arrives at that conclusion. The vote of no hon. member in this House would have been more welcome to the Administration of the day than that of the hon. member for Lethbridge, if he could have brought himself to the conclusion that this measure was right. Our only motive in introducing this measure is to safeguard the franchise of this country in a perilous crisis, in the interests of the Canadian people, and for no party advantage at all. I would like to know what party advantage can come to members on this side of the House by the passing of this measure which would not accrue to the hon. member for Lethbridge on exactly the same score. If it hurts us, it hurts him if he goes to his electors as a conscriptionist. If it benefits us, it benefits him, if he submits himeslf to his constituents on that subject. His views differ from ours as to the merits of the measure. For his views I have respect. But I would ask him to review the sentence in which he ascribed to us motives of animosity and of repudiating or rebuking conscriptionist Liberals on the other side.

I opened with the assertion that this was the widest measure of enfranchisement proportionate to population ever passed by a British community since the first Reform Bill. We disfranchise, it is true, a number of citizens. That is quite correct. We disfranchise them temporarily while this war lasts. The number of disfranchised is estimated by the hon. member for Saskatoon (Mr. McCraney) as about thirty thousand; my own judgment would place it higher, but there is no way of getting at anything like the exact figures. But we enfranchise, of those who would not get the vote at all if this measure were not passed, not less, in my judgment, than 400,000, perhaps 500,000 or more of the population of this country. Thus an estimate of 470,000 net addition to the electorate as a result of this measure if it passes Parliament is not far out of the way.

The Bill has two features. I take the first feature in my initial argument, the enfranchising feature, which gives the franchise to the near female relatives of the soldiers overseas. That is objected to by the hon. member for Lethbridge (Mr. Buchanan) on the ground that it is not strictly the line of service that is recognized, that there is a service on the part of womankind beyond the service of the woman whose husband, or brother, or father is fighting overseas. I agree that there is such a service, but the extent of service and the character of the sacrifice which the woman makes who works in a munitions factory, or knits, or sews, is not the same as that of the woman whose husband's, or whose brother's, life is in peril. The hon. member for Lethbridge takes very good care—and he does so advisedly and wisely, in my judgment—to speak no word that could be construed as committing him to the unlimited enfranchisement of women in this country at the present time. He wants to make the line of all service the line of franchise. How are we to tell, how could it be made practicable, to add to those whose near relatives are overseas those who knit and sew and attend Red Cross meetings and visit the afflicted? Could we ever draw such a line and establish it by legislation? He knows it is impracticable. He knows that we have to take a broad and general line, even although cases of individual injustice arise. We cannot enfranchise by individuals; we must enfranchise by classes. We draw the line where it can easily and clearly be drawn, at those who make the greatest and the highest sacrifice, and we say that, for the purposes of this war, that line is the most logical, the most defensible. Some line has to be drawn; no better line than that can be drawn.

It is argued as well that we throw a slur or cast some ignominy on those who do not enjoy the franchise under this Bill. I cannot agree with this reasoning. They were compared, in the language of the hon. member for Saskatoon (Mr. McCraney), to the negroes of the southern states. Why, it is only two or three months since, in this House, we were favoured with a resolution moved by the hon. member for St. John (Mr. Pugsley) that for the franchise of Canada we should adopt the provincial franchise, with female voters, which would have enfranchised the women of five provinces and refused the franchise to those of the other four! Were the women of the other four under his proposal to be likened to the negroes of the southern states? Not at all; but they would have been, if the reasoning of the hon. member for Saskatoon is correct.

We said at that time that whatever franchise was adopted for women should be Canada-wide, and should be enjoyed through all the provinces; and that prin-

ciple is embodied in this Bill. We favoured that motion, provided there were such limitations as Parliament should afterwards deem to be fitting. These are the limitations, and let those who dispute the justice or logic of these limitations suggest others to the members of this House. The reasoning of the Prime Minister this afternoon is conclusive. We could not go to the extent, under existing conditions, of enfranchising all the women of Canada. To do so would give no special representative vote to the overseas soldiers—in lieu of what an election now denies them. The women of Canada did not ask for the enfranchisement at this time of all the women. They have approached members of this Government and have protested against such a wide enfranchisement, because they felt that under the conditions of this war, with our heterogeneous population, the votes of those foremost in the women's suffrage movement would be defeated by the votes of those scattered throughout our country who are affected by sympathies not at all the same as those which actuate the great bulk of the women of this country.

The Bill denies qualification for the period of this war to those of alien enemy birth who have been naturalized since March 31, 1902, and to those of alien enemy blood, born in other countries and speaking the language of an alien enemy. It is contended vigorously on the part of the right hon. leader of the Opposition (Sir Wilfrid Laurier) that this is un-British, that it is a breach of a pledge given by this country, and that, whatever the consequence, we must not do this thing. I should like to know where that pledge is printed, where it was given. I have never seen it. I have seen pledges given to immigrants; they are embodied in Orders in Council. There have been pledges given exempting certain immigrants from military service in this country. Those pledges we respect. Any pledge given we respect. But no pledge has ever been given to immigrants in this country that is repudiated by this Bill.

Mr. KNOWLES: When any man is naturalized and becomes a naturalized British subject, is he not given a pledge to the effect that "he is, within Canada, entitled to all political and other rights, powers and privileges to which a natural-born British subject is entitled?"

Mr. MEIGHEN: Yes, but it adds that at the same time they must assume all our obligations. Does the hon. member say that, under that, there cannot be a limitation of the franchise? If so, how does he justify the Government of Saskatchewan, which he supports, and which disfranchised British subjects, naturalized, coming from China?

Mr. KNOWLES: What has that to do with this?

Mr. MEIGHEN: If there is a pledge, is not that pledge violated by that Act?

Mr. KNOWLES: Let us grant, for the sake of argument, that the legislature did very wrong.

Mr. MEIGHEN: I have not heard the hon. member complain of that legislature doing wrong in this matter. Why? Because he never until to-day interpreted naturalization in such a way.

Mr. KNOWLES: A pretty weak argument.

Mr. MEIGHEN: The rights of British subjects here are rights given under the law of Canada. The law of Canada must be dictated by the needs of the hour, for the safety of Canada. Does the hon. member say that in British Columbia there has been a breach of faith because for years past, if not since the birth of that province, they have refused the franchise to British subjects naturalized by the very same certificate, the Japanese and men of alien birth? Is it a breach of faith that those two provinces have done this for years? There is not a shadow of a breach of faith.

Mr. KNOWLES: I understand we were discussing whether Canada was breaking its pledged word, and I read the naturalization form from the Act.

Mr. MEIGHEN: Let the hon. member say that two provinces of Canada have dishonoured their pledged word since those two provinces were created. He will not say it; he knows it is not true.

Mr. A. K. MACLEAN: Were those people naturalized?

Mr. MEIGHEN: Certainly.

Mr. NEELY: By the provinces?

Mr. MEIGHEN: By the Dominion.

Mr. A. K. MACLEAN: They had no political rights.

Mr. MEIGHEN: Now we have a beautiful political distinction drawn by the hon. member for Halifax (Mr. A. K. Maclean), and approved by the hon. member for Renfrew (Mr. Graham), that the pledged word of this country given to immigrants in Canada may not be vio-

lated by the Dominion Parliament, but may be violated by provincial legislatures. Is the pledged word of Canada not of any moment to provincial legislatures? Does it mean nothing to them? The pledged word of this country is not violated any more by their legislation than it is by this Parliament now? There are others who were disfranchised in this country. They had not been likened to negroes before. Judges have no vote. Many British-born people have no vote. It is true this is the widest measure of the kind that has yet been placed on the statue book. It is abnormal. But we live in abnormal times. Hon. gentlemen opposite say these people have obeyed the law, and are all right. It is true that, in the main, they obey the law, and there has been little exception, all things considered, to the manner in which they have lived up to their obligations as citizens, but is it seriously argued by those who know these men coming from Germany and Austria, naturalized within the last fifteen years in Canada, are animated by the same sympathy in this war, as animates us, that, as a class, are anxious for Britain to win this war, and that they look upon the dread issue of this struggle in the same light as we? Let me put a case to hon. gentlemen opposite, and to the leader of the Opposition (Sir Wilfrid Laurier). Let me assume that one of the hon. gentlemen opposite goes abroad, in order to better his condition in the world. He goes to some European land. He takes up his abode there, and enters on a homestead. In order to get his patent, he has to take out naturalization papers in three years. After he is there a few years, a war breaks out between that country and his native land. He looks across, and finds his own brothers, and perhaps his own children, perhaps his father, his very next of kin, fighting in the armies of his native land, against that of his adopted country. Does any one want to seriously state to this Parliament that such a man would look upon the issue of that struggle as would his neighbours of the blood of his adopted land? Does any one suggest he would be animated by the same desire for the triumph of the army of his adopted country, as would those next door to him, who were of the blood of that adopted land? Human nature is human nature in us all, and is human nature in the German and Austrian in Canada. Would the right hon. gentleman want to be conscripted in that country to fight against his sons at home? Would he expect to be loaded down with the obligations of that war, as would his brothers fighting on the other side? I do not think he would. I do not think he would complain if relieved of those obligations in that country, he was refused a say in the direction of that war.

Is it true that in South Africa there were complaints, because at no time, though they took a large measure in the obligations of the country, were British subjects entitled to the franchise. But who that wants to be reasonable, would contend for a moment that, if the Transvaal had been at war with Great Britain, and if, during that war, and for the purposes of that war alone British subjects by birth naturalized in the Transvaal had been refused the franchise, that that would have been looked on as a breach of faith by us? Does any one conceive such an argument? Not at all. The franchise of peace time is founded on peace service and the franchise of war times is founded on war service. It is said by hon. gentlemen opposite, "Oh, we are as anxious to win this war as you are. This election is only being fought on the question of the best method to pursue to win the war." If the election has to be fought on the best method to pursue to win the war, why does the leader of the Opposition express so keen a desire to get the opinion of those who do not want to win the war at all, who cannot be expected by all principles of human nature to welcome the prospect of their brothers being slaughtered that our sons and brothers may triumph.

It is strenuously argued that this is a breach of faith? Did Australia commit a breach of faith? Is Australia blackened by the crime of Germany, because Australia deemed, under the circumstances of this war, that, as the obligations of war were lifted from the immigrants of alien enemy birth in that country, the privileges of the franchise must be lifted as well? Does any one say that the crime of the "scrap of paper" must be laid at the door of Australia? Such a thing never was suggested in the Australian House. A similar measure wider in its terms than this Bill, passed the Australian Parliament, almost without protest at all, and they disfranchised every man of alien enemy birth, no matter when he came to the country.

Mr. MARCIL (Bonaventure): Why do you start with 1902 in dealing with these people?

Mr. MEIGHEN: Unless we went back indefinitely, unless we disqualified those who—

Mr. MARCIL: Is that what Australia did?

Mr. MEIGHEN: She went back indefinitely.

Mr. MARCIL: If you followed the Australian precedent in one respect, why not follow it right through?

Mr. MEIGHEN: Because we think they went too far. Would the hon. gentleman go as far as they went? We strike a middle line. Australia disfranchised those who came to that country, no matter when they came. We say that if men have been in this country so long that one can reasonably expect that they have become, as it were, engrafted in the tree of Canada, that they feel as we feel, though perhaps not to the same degree, still to some safe degree, then we believe they are entitled to assume the war obligations of this country, and entitled to assume the franchise in war time.

Mr. MARCIL: Is there any precedent in England for war-time franchise?

Mr. MEIGHEN: They have had no war-time election—there is no precedent in England of a party forcing a war-time election.

Mr. MARCIL: Are elections not being held continually, all through the war, in England?

Mr. MEIGHEN: A few by-elections, but no general elections, and Great Britain is 95 to 98 per cent British-born, while we have a very substantial proportion of alien enemy birth.

It has also been vigorously asserted—although I do not know that we should be troubled by it, because there has never been an important measure introduced in Parliament with regard to which the same thing has not been asserted—that this is a partisan measure, designed to re-elect this Government. I desire to remind particularly the hon. member for Saskatoon (Mr. McCraney), and the hon. member for Medicine Hat (Mr. Buchanan) that the same thing has been asserted just as vigorously, just as consistently, and indeed, infinitely more strenuously with regard to the conscription measure of this Government. From one end of Canada to the other, those who do not want to further help the soldiers in France state that the reason we desired to pass such a measure was that we wanted to get back to power.

The argument now is based on the theory laid down by the hon. member for Saskatoon (Mr. McCraney), that those we enfranchise will support us, and that those we disqualified will oppose us. They charge repeatedly against us that such is our belief. If it is true—and apparently it is true, if hon. gentlemen opposite are right—that the majority of the women of this country whose near relatives are overseas, those who spend their days in anxiety and their nights in tears, will support us, and that those who, of all our population, are likely to favour the enemy, will reject us, then, in the name of the Government which has been striving for three years to fight that enemy, I accept the compliment.

I do believe that the majority of those in the trenches will support the Administration. I do believe also that the majority of those whose near relatives are overseas fighting the foe would rather support this Administration than support one formed by the leader of the Opposition. I further believe that those at the other end of the electoral thermometer, those whose sympathies, whose very heart-strings, are by nature tied to the enemy, are much more likely to support the leader of the Opposition than to support us. But I do not believe that that is an argument against this Bill; I do not believe that Liberals and Conservatives generally throughout Canada, or even those who are disqualified temporarily during war time, will so regard this measure. I have received communications from men who will be disqualified by this Bill—from men with whom I had had not the slightest communication on the subject until the Bill was brought down. I have received a communication from one of the leading members of a disfranchised community in the western country, in which he commended the Government for the action taken, saying that it removed the whole community from the embarrassing position in which it was placed by reason of the war We have been waited upon by representatives of communities of aliens; the Government has been urged that this step be taken. Representations to this end have been made by Liberals who want to see this war carried on; who do not want to see Canada slink from the field. I know that instinctively the Liberal mind—and instinctively our own mind, because our own mind in the best sense is liberal—does not

like the idea of disfranchisement. We should be glad if it were not necessary; yet I know scores of persons, who though at first resisting this measure or any measure of this kind, have since made the declaration that they believe the measure essential and right, and that they will support it. These words apply particularly to Liberals; if any hon. gentleman opposite desires me to name them, I shall be glad to do so at any time. I think that the great bulk of Liberals in this country who are anxious to go on and not to go back will support the measure that is now before the House.

Mr. D. B. NEELY (Humboldt): Mr. Speaker, I should be failing in my duty if I did not resent with every particle of strength in my being the uncalled for, unjustifiable, unrighteous insult offered to a large number of the people whom I represent by the proposals embodied in this Bill and by the statements made by the Secretary of State (Mr. Meighen) upon its introduction. Like other members of this House, I recognize the ability as a debater of the Secretary of State—some say he is a hair-splitter—but I never saw him make such a shamefaced performance as he did when he introduced this Franchise Bill the other day. It was the utterance of a man who was ashamed, Sir, of what he was doing. I give him credit—

Mr. SPEAKER: Order. The hon. member should resume his seat when the Speaker rises. The hon. member is certainly exceeding the rules of debate; I would ask him to take more cognizance of them.

Mr. NEELY: I shall have to keep myself within the rules, but I may tell you frankly, Mr. Speaker, that when several hundreds of my constituents, as loyal a people as there are in Canada, are being insulted by the Secretary of State, I find it very difficult to observe the rules of debate and of parliamentary procedure. I should like to know wherein I make an unfair comment when I say that in my judgment the performance of the Secretary of State when he introduced this measure was that of a man who was ashamed of what he was doing.

Mr. SPEAKER: The hon. member uses unparliamentary language when he addresses that remark to the Secretary of State. He is at liberty to characterize the measure as he wishes, provided he uses parliamentary language. But he is not in order when he applies such a remark to the Secretary of State.

Mr. NEELY: Well, I have said what I had to say on that point, anyway. If you are willing, Mr. Speaker, I will pass on to the next.

Sir GEORGE FOSTER: I think that my hon. friend, having said something of a member that he should not have said, and having been called to order for doing so, should have withdrawn the assertion.

Mr. NEELY: Mr. Speaker, while I am willing to accept your ruling in respect to anything that I have said, I do not want any lecture from the Minister of Trade and Commerce as to what is right and what is wrong in parliamentary procedure.

Sir GEORGE FOSTER: Mr. Speaker, I ask that the—

Mr. SPEAKER: Order. I took the statement of the hon. member for Humboldt as a withdrawal, and consequently I did not ask for a retraction in terms.

Mr. NEELY: One of the chief reasons put forward by the Secretary of State, for the disfranchisement of a certain class of people in this country was that it was in the interests of the safety of the State. that such a course should be taken. Does that not mean that a certain class of citizens in Canada are not to be trusted with the franchise? If a certain class of the citizens of this country cannot be trusted with the franchise at this time, then my hon. friend had better include in that class—after all, the election is to be held upon the question of method as to winning the war—the thousands of British, English, French, Scotch, Canadian-born in this country who, if a referendum on conscription were submitted to the people to-morrow, would vote against any such measure. If only men who come within the jurisdiction of the Military Service measure are to be given the franchise, then a large number of the members of this House would be disfranchised. Every man over forty-five years of age would be disfranchised.

Mr. PUGSLEY: Even the Solicitor-General.

Mr. NEELY: Those were the reasons given—considerations of loyalty and the question of military service. If disloyalty means nothing more than voting against this Government because they have brought in a measure of compulsory service, my hon. friend will find, before the election is over, that there are tens of thousands, aye, hundreds of thousands of people in Canada

who may be branded as disloyal. The Dominion Government, in the days gone by, went into the highways and byways to bring population into this country, to help build up Canada, to develop the great prairies that Providence has placed within our charge, and a large part of this new immigration has, in recent years, gone west of the Great Lakes to fill up our great new provinces. We have been doing our best, through our public schools and our universities, to assimilate and Canadianise that alien population. In my own province of Saskatchewan, since that province was formed in 1905, a new school district has been organized practically every day of every week. The result has been that we have been able to establish a provincial university, and when the war broke out in 1914 there were represented in the University of Saskatchewan no less than seventeen different nationalities. Nearly half of the class roll of 1914 have enlisted and gone to the war, many of them being aliens. Some of them are of German origin, some of Galician origin, and some of Russian origin; but they have gone just the same. With the burden thrown upon us by the federal authorities, and with very small resources with which to carry on our work —for we have not, in the prairie provinces, control of our natural resources—we have been trying to assimilate and Canadianise those various elements of population. We have been meeting with a very large measure of success. But now this Government, by this Bill, will do more injury to that cause than anything that could possibly have happened in this House or in any other legislative assembly in Canada. The Government, by the imputation and the insinuation which they have embodied in this Bill, are casting a slur and an insult upon, and doing an injury to, a large class of our population. That insult will rankle in their hearts until their dying day, and also in the hearts of their children and of their children's children.

When this war broke out in 1914, I happened to be in my home town of Humboldt. A recruiting meeting was called, and on the platform with me was a citizen of that town who was born in Germany. This man came as a child to the United States; he took out his citizenship papers there, when he was old enough, and he served in the United States army in the Spanish-American war. Some years ago he came into Canada and took out his citizenship papers in this country. That man made this statement: It grieves me that my motherland has declared war aganist Great Britain, the land of my adoption, it grieves me that the people of my adopted country will be going over to fight against my kith and kin who are serving in the German army; but when I came into this country and swore allegiance to the King of Britain, I meant every word of my oath of allegiance, and I for one am prepared to stand by the land of my adoption. That man is disfranchised under this measure now before this Parliament. That surely is a fine reward for communities which have contributed as much as my constituency has done—I am speaking now for my own constituency, because I know it. In my constituency the population, which is largely of German origin, has contributed carloads of flour to the Belgian Relief Fund, and it is contributing tens of thousands of dollars to the Canadian Red Cross and other war funds. Numbers of the sons of German parents have volunteered for service in the army. At the commencement of the war they were rejected because of nationality, but some of them managed to enlist by stating that they were Russians. Some of them, whom I have in mind, have been on the casualty list three or four different times. As my hon. friend from Medicine Hat (Mr. Buchanan) says: What evidence have this Government to show that those people are not to be trusted with the franchise? The Government have submitted to this House absolutely nothing but an ungrounded suspicion. Some legal gentleman may tell us that these people are under contract with the country from which they came. The country from which they came may have passed laws that demand allegiance from their subjects after they go abroad, but those subjects, when they come to this country and take the oath of allegiance here, are not compelled to follow the edicts of their motherland. I know for a fact that, in my own part of Saskatchewan, hardly a German reservist responded to the call of the motherland when Germany, at the commencement of the war, sent orders that they should return and report to their military headquarters in the old country. Why was that so? It was because the great majority of those people left their several countries in order to get away from the oppression of a military autocracy. They came to Canada because Canada was the land of the free. And they are getting a fine dose from the present Government. Whey they read this Bill, they will waken up to something, and that is this, that the present

Government at Ottawa apparently have quite as much consideration for solemn treaty obligation as the man who brought on this war, the Kaiser of Germany. A treaty to him was "a scrap of paper," and our boys have gone overseas to teach him another lesson on that point, namely, that solemn treaty obligations are something more than this.

In order to teach the Emperor of Germany that solemn treaty obligations are to be respected, this government is undertaking to secure the necessary aid for the winning of the war by actually demonstrating by this Bill that national obligations are nothing more than "a scrap of paper." They are demonstrating it by taking away the franchise from a class of men who, according to the record and according to the fact, have done nothing against the interest of this country. On the contrary, since the war broke out, they have given as generously, as freely, and as liberally to every war benefit as any other section of this great Dominion. More than that, they have not refused military service. If the Solicitor General can furnish evidence that any large section of the people of whom I speak have come to him seeking disfranchisement I should like to know something about it; I have represented a constituency for a number of years and am naturally in the confidence of the people to some extent, and I have not heard of a single constituent of mine who has made known any such desire.

The arguments advanced by the Secretary of State for the disfranchisement of these people are as fine a piece of sophistry as one could wish for. We must not send these men, he says, to fight against their kin. Does he not know that in the South African War there were Boers fighting against Boers? What about the war between the North and South, where blood relation was fighting against blood relation, and even brother against brother? Why should my hon. friend assume that these men are not prepared to go to the trenches if they are called upon to go? He has no right to assume anything of the sort unless they have refused military service, in which case there might be some ground for his contention. It this Bill is intended to win the war, and if it is therefore regarded as important to disfranchise the men of this country who are not prepared to vote for the present government, this Bill does not go nearly far enough. Since the closure has been adopted to prevent a full and fair discussion of this question in this House, I can assure, you, Sir, and my hon. friend the Solicitor General and the other members of the government that before this measure takes effect in an election it is going to be very thoroughly discussed in the country.

At six o'clock the House took recess.

After Recess.

The House resumed at eight o'clock.

Hon. GEORGE P. GRAHAM (South Renfrew): Mr. Speaker, perhaps it is unfortunate that when Bills of this kind are introduced and rules are enforced to rush them through the House, that other parliamentary rules are not to be deviated from, in order that members may use the language that comes to their minds most readily in reference thereto. I have no hesitation in saying that I consider the introduction of this Bill an insult to myself as a member of this House, and as a member of the Liberal party. Perhaps it is well that the air should be cleared in some way, and this Bill has certainly clarified it, though it has to a certain extent muddied the political pool. To those who had been giving the Government credit for placing patriotism and the winning of the war above partyism, the introduction of a measure of this kind, so purely partisan in its character, must come as a rude shock. That the measure is partisan in character needs no words of proof from me. The Secretary of State demonstrated it to the hilt in his remarks this afternoon. Near the close of his address, in a fit of exuberant pride, he told the House that he believed the vast majority of the new voters would vote for the present Government. He also told the House that he believed those who are being disfranchised would have voted for the Liberal party had they been allowed to retain their full citizenship.

Some hon. MEMBERS: Hear, hear.

Mr. GRAHAM: In these two statements, coupled with the "hear, hear" of the hon. gentlemen who hope to profit politically by this Bill, is the proof that the Bill was introduced solely for partisan purposes, and that neither nearly nor remotely has it anything to do with the winning of the war. On the contrary, its effect will be to retard much of the noble effort which has heretofore been put forth by people in the Dominion of Canada who are not sufficiently fortunate to have members of their family at the front. There are four classes affected

by this Bill: aliens of enemy origin; men who do not believe in war; women who are enfranchised; women who are refused the franchise. The women who are refused the franchise are put in the same class with the men who do not want to fight, and with the alien enemy; and the Government can give us all the sophistry it chooses as to why these women are not given the right to vote, but it still remains sophistry. The Government does not believe that these women would vote for them in an election, and that is the reason why they are not given the franchise. This is in line with the argument of the Solicitor General. Let me take up, first, those of alien enemy origin. The situation is this. The Government says to the man who has remained truly loyal under very severe conditions: "We will place upon your brow and upon the brows of your children the brand of disloyalty and treachery, and the shame of it will follow you as long as you live, while we who have remained loyal because this is our mother country and it is easy for us to be loyal, will smite our breasts and thank God we are not as other men, or even as those aliens who remain loyal under present circumstances." The reward the Government proposes to give to those men who remain loyal under present trying conditions is to deprive them of the citizenship which has been guaranteed to them. I ask hon. gentlemen is that an incentive to loyalty? Does it tend to breed patriotism among newcomers to this country? Will it impress upon the mind of the newcomer the fairness of British institutions? Will it show that we are the exemplars of the purest liberty under the sun? It gives a directly contrary impression, and I say now that this act of the Government will do more to cause unrest and to create misgivings among those who come from foreign lands to Canada than anything that has happened since Confederation. And, further, it will do more to retard immigration into Canada than anything this Government or any other Government could do. The Prime Minister went through the West on a laudable tour, making patriotic speeches. We all read those speeches, and thought they would have a good effect. The men to whom they were addressed, as well as their wives, listened to these speeches carefully, and were undoubtedly impressed. What do we find now? The men who listened to those patriotic words spoken throughout our western country—the men who came to the head of this Government, the Prime Minister of Canada, to gain from him knowledge of the freedom for which we were fighting, knowledge of the genius of our constitution, knowledge of those rights which come to every man who takes up citizenship under the Union Jack—these men went home, and profited by those words. They did their best for the cause, rejoicing in the freedom which they had. And now they are branded as traitors, without any explanation or reason being given to this House or to the country. This Bill not only disfranchises men of alien enemy origin who have come to this country since 1902, but it disfranchises many men in the province of Ontario, who have been among our very best citizens for the last thirty or forty years, men whose taxation for carrying on the war is great, men whose wives have laboured early and late, men who have sacrificed much, and some men whose sons are at the front. If this other clause had not been put in—

Some hon. MEMBERS: "If."

Mr. GRAHAM: Let me explain what I mean, because objection will be immediately taken to this—

Some hon. MEMBERS: "If."

Mr. GRAHAM: I will clear up the point in a moment. There are men in this country who came from other lands, took up their residence here, and for twenty years they have been voting in Canada. Hon. members in this House can call them by name. They are good citizens, and they believed they had the right to vote. That right of citizenship was never questioned by either side of politics. When this war broke out, they discovered that, although they had been voting for many years, they had never gone through the formality of becoming naturalized. Being loyal citizens, and to show that they were true to the Union Jack and the British Empire, they immediately took out their naturalization papers. But they have only been naturalized two or three years. And although they have been building up this country, paying taxes and raising their families although they are a credit to the country, by this Bill they find themselves disfranchised, and marked among their neighbours as men unworthy to be trusted with citizenship.

I want to know if that is going to have a good effect on the people by whom they are surrounded, or on the people in the coun-

tries from which we expect to get immigration in the future.

Now, as to conscientious objectors. It may be said, and it is said, that these men seldom vote anyway. That they do not care to take part in political strife, and that to deprive them of their franchise is not a very serious matter. For a man to refrain from exercising a right because he wishes to is one thing, but to be deprived of that right by statute is a very different thing; and the man, even although he has not voted, and his son who has voted, will resent for all time to come the interference of this Government which says to them that they are not entitled to exercise the franchise for the election of men to represent them in Parliament and to spend the public revenues to which they contribute. Taxation without representation is one of the things that was fought against at the time of the Family Compact. We had thought in this country that it had been driven from our shores for all time to come, and it has been the pride of the Canadian people that equal rights have been given to every man, no man being asked to pay taxes unless he is allowed a full voice in the expenditure of those taxes. Here are a class of men who contribute largely to the revenues of the country, a class of men who never harm anybody, friendly, peaceful—and they are to be told now: You cannot exercise your franchise, and your son cannot exercise his franchise, and in the years to come your son and his sons and daughters will be pointed out, will have the finger of scorn pointed at them throughout the Dominion of Canada as men who, in a crisis in this country, were deemed unworthy to be allowed to exercise the franchise if they had so desired. I say it is an unfair thing, it is a bad business; and although the Secretary of State said this afternoon that he believed the people of Canada would support the Government in this measure, I tell him I believe that he is all wrong, because what is deeply imbedded in the British heart is fair play to everybody and the maxim that everybody is innocent until proven guilty. But this Government undertakes to say that men who are as innocent —why, they did not even pretend to make a charge against them—are to be declared guilty without a charge made against them, guilty of a lack of intelligence and integrity such as to unfit them to exercise the franchise. The Von Hollweg of this Government will have to stand side by side with the man who said that a treaty is but a "scrap of paper." The Secretary of State this afternoon argued around that very carefully, as he is capable of doing. But the fact remains that, through the Department of the Secretary of State, certain guarantees have been given to men coming to this country, so long as they behave themselves, and one of those guarantees is that they can exercise all political rights. In dishonouring this guarantee, this Government has done just what the Prussian Government did in violating the treaty with Belgium.

Now I come to another class, the women who are enfranchised. The women who are enfranchised, the Secretary of State declares, would number about 500,000; and in palliation of the offence of depriving other citizens of their rights, he declared that the number disfranchised is so infinitesimally small as compared with those enfranchised, that it is not much of a crime after all. Sir, it is not by size or by numbers that the Act will be judged by the people of Canada; it is the principle behind the Act which will bring condemnation on this Government. If only a few were to be disfranchised, then the argument of the Secretary of State that it was necessary to do so for the safety of the State, has no foundation whatever. If the number is so infinitesimally small that it will make no difference in the election, then his argument must go by the board. But he believes, or I think he believes, that this number is so distributed among certain constituencies that it will have the desired effect politically, although in the aggregate the number is not very large. Now, as to the women who are enfranchised. I am fully in accord with enfranchising women who are closely related to the men who have gone to the front; but I am not in favour of disfranchising those who have no relatives to go to the front but who have done everything they could. The Secretary of State argued that it would be so difficult to get these other women on the list that you would have to make a distinction somewhere; some women you would not dare to put on the list—I have not heard any one say who they were as yet. But I do know that the poor washerwoman who is contributing her fifty cents a week to the Patriotic Fund and has no male relatives to go to the front, is doing all that in her lies for this country, and she should not be deprived of any privilege given to any other women in the Dominion of Canada. In this connection, the Minister of Trade and Commerce (Sir George Foster) has stood on the platform with myself

on many occasions on behalf of patriotic funds. He has said to the women and to the men: You who cannot go to the front and have no relatives to go to the front can do all that in you lies at home, and your duty will be as fully performed by doing those things as if you were a man and went to the front yourself. To that appeal, made eloquently, as only the Minister of Trade and Commerce can make an appeal, the women of Canada have nobly responded. Day after day, night after night, hour after hour, have they toiled—women in the Red Cross, the Daughters of the Empire, women of other associations, women not attached to any association, knitting by night, sewing by day, preparing comforts for the sons of others, for our sons who are at the front—and, forsooth, this Government says to the woman who is fortunate enough to be represented at the front: We are going to let you have the vote, but this other woman who has done her part nobly, as did the woman of old, she shall have no voice or lot in the government of this country. Thousands of women have contributed generously to the Red Cross Fund. Many of these women have not representatives at the front; they regret it just as much as any person else can; but they have taken up the burden of the work, they have performed it nobly and well—and this Government, forsooth, draws the line in front of them and says: You cannot have any voice in running the affairs of this country. I cannot understand the frame of mind that brings men to that conclusion. I have listened carefully to the excuses given for not placing these women on the voters' list—I have yet to find any reason given, they have been mere excuses—and I come back again to this point, that the women who have provided bandages for the boys at the front and have seen them soaked by party heelers as they went through; the women who provided comforts for the boys at the front, and have seen them diverted to other uses across the sea, are so down on this Government that the Government is afraid to trust them with the franchise.

Mr. BRADBURY: That is a dirty statement.

Mr. GRAHAM: I repeat that the bandages were soaked in party patronage and rake-off before they got to the soldiers. That has been proven, and I can give the House further evidence of it, if it is desired. The Secretary of State said he believed all these women who were given votes would vote for the Government. I tell him now that he will find himself mistaken in regard to that. The women of this country know something about the management of public affairs. They want honesty in administration, and if ever there was a time in the history of Canada when the women have taken a deep interest in our affairs, it has been during the past two or three years. They have given up their sons to this cause; if they have no sons to send, they have given up their energy, their effort, their work and their money to aid the Allies. They are watching the conduct of public affairs; and the Government will find when the election time comes that, although this Bill has been brought in for party purposes only, the effect expected to be gained will not be gained, but very much the reverse.

An hon. MEMBER: Perhaps the hon. gentleman may run into the Senate.

Mr. GRAHAM: I may say that I have not been trying to run into the Senate yet. I will run wherever there is a fight, because the Government never lets me run without a fight, whatever pledges they make beforehand.

Mr. W. H. BENNETT: I have had the honour of having the nomination in one riding for twenty-six years, and stayed there. I have never been run out.

Mr. GRAHAM: I had the honour of helping to lick the hon. gentleman once. I know that. I should like to direct my attention to the hon. Minister of Finance (Sir Thomas White). He has been asking the people to save, and they have been saving. The reward he gives to people for saving is that he becomes a party to a Bill to deprive them of their rights as citizens. Through the Food Controller, the Government has been asking the women of Canada to curtail expenditure. The encouragement to these people, in return for their economy, is that they shall not be allowed to vote unless they comply with certain conditions, which many of them cannot comply with. I want to know what effect that is going to have on the future enthusiasm of these women for war work. I said that this Bill, if it became law, would militate against the progress of the war, and I repeat that statement. The thousands of upright women, rich and poor, who have been labouring hourly, daily, weekly and yearly, in order that success might come to the Allies, find themselves now confronted with the rebuff, the rebuke, the stigma, by this Government, that though they have done all

this they are not entitled to the franchise but must be classed with alien enemies and men who do not want to fight.

Mr. SPEAKER: The hon. gentleman's time is more than up.

Mr. GRAHAM: I seldom break the rules of the House, and I will not try to break the rule now. I will try and conclude in one word, although it may be a long one.

Mr. SPEAKER: Not very long.

Mr. GRAHAM: We ask immigrants to come to this country. On the success of immigration to Canada depends our ability to meet the financial stress that will come upon us, and this Government has done more by this Bill to cripple us financially than anything that has happened since this Parliament opened.

Mr. W. F. MACLEAN: I am in favour of the Bill now before the House, for several reasons. First, I am in favour of it on its merits; and second, I am in favour of it because of the necessities of the war. We have had during this session three important war measures before the House. We have passed the conscription Bill, imposing military duties on all our men of a certain age, because of the necessities of the war. We tried to secure enough men by the voluntary system. We found it impossible to secure them, and, of necessity, we had to pass a conscription law. We owe it to the men who have gone to the front, to pass such a measure, and we also owe it to the men who have died at the front. The great historical precedent for our sending men to the front is that of the Greeks, when they fought for their liberty over 2,500 years ago. The people of Sparta sent 300 of their fighting men to Thermopylae, and every one of the 300, with only one exception, was buried on that field of honour, and, to their military glory, a stone was erected, and on that stone was the inscription: Go stranger, tell the Spartans that we lie here, having faithfully observed their commands. Instead of 300 men we have left 30,000 on the warfields of Europe; and we owe it to them to pass this law of compulsory military service. We passed it of necessity. Now, we are passing two other measures, a law to secure the votes of the soldiers, and providing how that vote is to be recorded, and now this law in regard to franchise. Both of these laws were rendered necessary because of the refusal of Parliament to ask for an extension of its life. I am in favour of the Bill now under discussion both because of the additions it makes to the voting population and also because of the restrictions it makes. As to the additions: For many years I have expressed the belief that women of this country should have the vote. The women of England have been given the franchise, or the proposal is coming up soon. It is more or less limited,—but they are giving them votes. The opportunity comes at a time of necessity to give the women votes, and we are giving them votes in two cases. We are giving votes to the women who are serving at the front, and we now propose to give votes to the women who are kith and kin to the men who are serving at the front. No mistake will be made to give the vote to a portion of the women of our country. Great problems will have to be solved in Canada, as a result of this war, and nobody will have a better right to be consulted, as to the settlement of those problems, than the women of this country. They are in every way fitted to exercise the franchise, but it will take some time to settle the question of how the rights of all are to be guarded, as pointed out by the Prime Minister. But the great fact is that we are enfranchising a lot of women of this country. The matter is urgent, and has to be put through in a short time. We may not include all the women, but once it is started as it has been started in England, limiting it to those of thirty years of age and imposing other conditions, it will make progress in future. The provinces of Canada have given women votes in a number of cases. The likelihood is that the United States will have a federal franchise applicable to women. They will soon have it in Great Britain, and we are starting it now. No mistake is being made in giving votes to women.

I am in sympathy with the disfranchising of quite a number of people in this country. There is a good deal to be argued for the side of the case presented by the hon. gentlemen who preceded me. But, although it is true that we ought to give votes to those who become citizens of Canada, there may be times when necessity compels us to revise our attitude on that question. The hon. gentleman refers to Bethmann-Hollweg and men of his school. I may point out that because of the intrigues of these men, because of the necessity of our acting in self-defence, because of the exigencies of the occasion, we have to limit this franchise as we propose to limit it

The national security, particularly when it is in jeopardy, is a matter of supreme importance. The necessities of the occasion count for more than even the pledges we may have given in regard to political rights; as a war measure we may have to restrict rights that may have been conceded. Many people in this country, Liberals and Conservatives—I speak from no partisan point of view—see the real national necessity of limiting the votes of these persons of alien enemy birth who have already got their citizenship. No great injustice will be done to them. Even though there may be an injustice, having regard to the knowledge we have of German and Austrian intrigues, I do not think that a great error will have been committed. I believe that the American republic, before their people come to vote, will insist upon some kind of federal law defining what shall constitute citizenship in the United States and stating to whom the vote shall be allowed. The Americans are having a great experience just now. They have not told us yet what revelations have been made to the President and his Cabinet at Washington concerning the ramifications of German intrigues. We are getting a taste of it now in the revelations that have been made in Great Britain. That being the case, the national safety demands that the franchise of these people shall be limited. Australia has taken action in this respect, not because of any hostility to the people who came there and helped them to settle the country, but for a national reason; for the safety and welfare of the Commonwealth. They are not denounced for doing that; neither should we be denounced for taking this action in a case of supreme importance.

I have pointed out that we have been compelled to take this step as a war measure and because the Opposition saw fit to oppose the extension of the life of this Parliament. We had to pass the measure of conscription, having regard to our national needs; but the passing of two other measures, the one for giving the soldiers opportunity to vote and the other the provision for the regulation, extension and limitation of the franchise, would not have been necessary had an extension of the life of Parliament been made. Moreover, we would not have needed these two measures if Parliament had had what it ought to have—the right to regulate the length of its own life. I believe that Australia has that power; but we have not. One of the questions to be settled in this Parliament in the future will be the right of the Canadian Parliament to regulate the length of a parliament. You cannot settle in a short time this question of citizenship; the question of to what extent a man shall be given the right to vote, the question of what limitation shall be attached to the franchise, having regard to the effect upon it of the operation of naturalization laws. Because necessity compels us to extend the franchise in some directions and to limit it in others, it does not follow that we are doing any injustice to a large number of the citizens of the country, but it does follow that we are doing something for the security of the nation and for the protection of the liberties of the people. You cannot take chances on a supreme issue of this kind; you must do what you think is right. This measure is a war measure; it is for war-election purposes. The Bill is justified, to my mind, and I think it certainly will be supported by the people whom I represent. I have no fear of the addition of a large number of women to the voting strength of this country. They will discharge their duty from the highest ground of patriotism and from no partisan point of view. I am willing to leave the matter to them.

You talk about national unity in this country, and the necessity for it. How is national unity to be expected? National unity will be attained only if we observe some of the things that we have neglected hitherto. One of the first things necessary for the creation of national unity is a federal franchise. Sir John A. Macdonald was the first man who laid that principle down in Parliament. I often heard him speak on that point; from the first time I heard him I have believed in the principle, and I have asserted it in this House. I am rather an old member now; I was in the House at the time we abandoned federal franchise and substituted the provincial franchise therefor. I never agreed with that course, and I do not agree with it yet; I believe in a federal franchise. Moreover, as I have said, I am confident that the American people will be compelled to adopt a federal franchise. Another thing that you must have in order to effect national unity—the Americans are coming to it—is federal enforcement of federal law. We run too much in this country in the direction of provincialism; we have to acquire more and more the nature of nationals.

We have to believe in the federal enforcement of federal laws. We have to become accustomed to look to the federal power for the defence of national and pub-

lic rights. We are now going through that experience. We are finding out that, in acting on the old lines that we followed for fifty years we were not acting quite in the right direction. We are retracing our steps and coming back to the views held by the old leader of the national policy in the old days. He believed also in a national franchise, and we are coming back to his view; and we shall make no mistake if we have a national franchise. We shall make no mistake if we enfranchise the women. We shall make no mistake if we declare that under the necessities that this war has imposed on us, we are going to revise and rewrite the law in regard to naturalisation. We have been too free in regard to our naturalisation law, and it must be rewritten. If there is anything that the war is teaching us to-day, it is this, that there must be a limitation in regard to naturalisation because of our experience of German and of Austrian ideas of integrity in connection with this war. We would have had no necessity for these two Acts at this session, if we had taken measures to extend the life of Parliament probably until the war was over. But, that not having been done, the duty is imposed upon this Parliament to take steps upon the first opportunity to give this Parliament a power that the Australian Parliament has, and a power that we are fully competent to exercise, the power to settle in our own House how long Parliament ought to continue. We should not be cribbed, cabined and confined in that respect. We are a nation, and we are to-day that portion of the North American continent that is leading this continent in the defence of the great public rights that began to be recognized at the establishment of the commonwealth in England and that have come down through all these years. While for a time we may be charged with interfering with citizenship or with breaking a pledge, I do not think we are quite breaking a pledge. As a friend pointed out to me this afternoon, often when a man in this country is summoned to sit on the jury, a case will come up for trial in which a friend of his happens to be the person to be tried. In such a case the court very properly says to that citizen: You must not try this case because you are an interested party. In this case we are saying to certain people of alien birth: Inasmuch as you are closely related to the man who is being tried here—and the Kaiser and all his works are to-day on trial because of his assaults on liberty—you must stand aside on this trial. We do not deprive that man of his rights, but we say: On this occasion it is not fitting that you should be a juryman or a judge, and the citizen is the juryman or the judge to whom we are appealing in the coming election. While there may be some ground for the argument that has been made that we are limiting the rights of people whom we have invited to this country, still if we are doing that, we are not doing it because we want to deny them their rights, so much as because we are determined to save the nation in this hour of its extreme peril. The women of this country are with us in this respect. Whether they will vote for us I cannot say, but I do say we are making no mistake in recognizing the principle of "Votes for Women." We are in this country recognizing the principle of public ownership, and now we are recognizing the right of the women of this country to vote. The women, certainly the women of my own province, will not resent the fact that the measure has not been made a broad one at the beginning. As was pointed out this afternoon, it will take time to settle the extent of the women's vote, and we shall have to very carefully revise the laws of naturalisation. This measure, to my mind, is both a progressive one and one of necessity, and that being the case, I intend to vote for it and to justify my vote whenever I am called on to do so outside of this House. I believe the majority of the people of this country are in favour of this law, not from any partisan point of view, but because of its fairness and because the necessities of the war compel us to enact it.

Mr. A. K. MACLEAN (Halifax): Mr. Speaker, my hon. friend (Mr. W. F. Maclean) has promised us that if he is ever called upon, outside of this House, to justify the vote he proposes giving on this measure he will be able and prepared to do so. Certainly he did not this evening give any reasons in justification of his vote. Therefore, probably the first opportunity he will have of making that justification will be outside of this Parliament. The substantial utterance he made this evening in support of this Bill was that national interests were in jeopardy unless this measure was enacted. It would have better become that hon. gentleman had he attempted to give to this House his reasons for believing that national interests were in jeopardy. If national interests are in jeopardy, then probably this measure is justifiable, but when an hon. gentleman states that the

justification of this measure is that national interests are in jeopardy, it is his duty to give to the House at least a few reasons as to why he believes that to be the case. He gives, as a reason in justification of his vote in favour of this measure, the fact that the life of Parliament was not extended. We very nearly had an election in the fall of 1914, and my hon. friend was then in favour of an election. In that event, there was not and there could not have been a Franchise Act of this character. I remember reading the Sunday edition of a paper published by my hon. friend in the city of Toronto in the spring of 1915 to the effect that in a few days Parliament would be dissolved and there would be an election.

Mr. W. F. MACLEAN: If there had been an election, it would not have done any harm.

Mr. A. K. MACLEAN: In that event there would have been no opportunity to enact a measure of this kind. Therefore, in the two principal points my hon. friend attempted to make this evening in support of this measure, namely, that the national interests were in danger and that the Government was refused an extension of Parliament, he has signally failed in making good his statements. The Bill before the House proposes to disfranchise arbitrarily a portion of the people of this country. It proposes to enfranchise another section of our population who are defined in the Bill and who are principally relatives of those who have enlisted for service overseas. I have no difficulty in reaching a conclusion as to what should be my duty in the premises. This legislation is objectionable in principle, and I deny that there is anything in the world to justify its introduction or its enactment. Public sentiment in this country is not behind this legislation. There is practically no sentiment in favour of it to-day, and there will be less as time proceeds. I have reference to disfranchising clauses.

I submit that reason and justice clearly point out the duty of members of Parliament in connection with this Bill. A proper regard for the future of this country and for our good name among the nations and peoples of the world compel one to oppose the measure. It is not founded upon any principle of a substantial character, and I repeat what others have said, that it violates without cause an implied compact made between the State and a number of our citizens. It does violence to principles and traditions long established and long cherished in all British countries. I believe it will be regarded as an act of injustice to-day, and that it will leave a legacy of distrust to a great number of people who will come into Canada in future years, which distrust will not easily be extinguished. Further, I believe it will perpetuate in the after-war politics of this country political incidents which should be forgotten. In our western country you will find one particular party, during political campaigns, appealing to the alien-born population for support upon the ground that another party during this war disfranchised aliens, and at the same time the other political party will be engaged in denying that allegation, which will be merely an encouragement to false testimony. Or if not doing that, they will be giving other reasons, and the result will be that many war incidents will be perpetuated. I believe, it is much better that they should end with the ending of the war. I maintain that history will adjudge the act contemplated by this Bill as a blot upon our national career. And, unfortunately, it comes at a time when we are writing glorious and imperishable pages of our history, which will be the future epics of this young nation. We have solicited to our shores the citizens whom we now attempt to deprive of one of the rights of citizenship. In their native countries before their departure, we have heralded the glories of our institutions. These immigrants have come here, and no one to-day is called upon to defend them against any acts of sedition or treason or infidelity to their vows of citizenship. In this Western hemisphere, some day when the war is over, we will need more European settlers, as our economic future and salvation depends upon that. Many of the class whom we are now disfranchising by this Bill will be coming to this country, not directly from Europe, but from the United States, and I doubt if we shall not welcome them. Now I ask you, Sir, will this proposed Act fortify their faith in our political institutions? Is it worth while? Will it protect anything that is in danger to-day? What did my hon. friend from South York (Mr. W. F. Maclean) mean when he said that national interests were in jeopardy?

Mr. W. F. MACLEAN: If Germany succeeds where would our country be?

Mr. A. K. MACLEAN: Did he say what he meant, or did he mean what he said? We have heard members of the Government give reasons in support of this

legislation, and we have had an opportunity of reading the Bill, and I say that in this Bill the Government do not mean what they say, or they do not say what they mean. It reminds me of the collision between two cross-eyed waiters in the dining room, which caused a downfall in china. One of the waiters said to the other, "Why don't you look where you're going," and the other replied, "Why don't you go where you're looking." If the Government meant to make this a war franchise based upon war services, they should have said so in the Bill, and if they meant something else they should admit that they did not say what they meant.

9 p.m.

The Solicitor General denied most violently this afternoon that there was any violation of an implied contract between the State and the citizen in disfranchising the citizen, and he referred to the fact that in the province of Manitoba Chinamen, though naturalized as British subjects, have never been given the franchise. I apprehend a distinction between that case and the one under discussion. In the one case the State has seen fit to withhold the franchise from a certain class of people but in the other case the State has seen fit to give the franchise. It is now proposed to take away the franchise from these people without showing cause. If the franchise is to be taken away from them, I say let cause be shown, and if it is impressive, if it is substantial, just and right, then we upon this side of the House will acknowledge it.

To a large extent, this is a practical question. Let us see how many people it will affect. Will it affect such a large number of people that in the national interests their names should be removed from the franchise roll? If but a small number of the people will be affected, is it good business on the part of this country to enact it? If national interests are not involved and are not in jeopardy, by continuing the franchise to our alien-born, is this legislation really worth while? In that respect, therefore, this is a practical question. Now, how many foreign-born people are there in this country who will be affected by this measure? Some hon. gentlemen have already given the figures. I wish to repeat some of them, and I think it important that we should keep this in mind. In considering this Bill the people of Canada will naturally inquire, in the first instance, how many people of the enemy class there are in this country, and secondly, what is their record as citizens during the war. In many of the provinces there is practically no German or Austrian population. The foreign-born population of Nova Scotia is about four per cent, and New Brunswick three per cent. Of the population of Prince Edward Island 99.4 is Canadian-born. The German and Austrian population of the province of Quebec is almost negligible. In the province of Ontario there is a large German population, the descendants, in the main, of settlers who came from Pennsylvania over one hundred years ago. In 1911, there were in the province of Ontario 7,871 German males over twenty-one years of age born in Europe, of whom 5,143 were naturalized. There were 10,420 Austro-Hungarians of twenty-one years of age, of whom 1,049 were naturalized. In other words, the number in the province of Ontario is almost negligible, and that may be said of the province of British Columbia as well. It is in the three prairie provinces that we find the vast majority of alien enemy population. According to the figures given to the House on Saturday evening last by the hon. member for Saskatoon (Mr. McCraney), there have come into the prairie provinces since 1900, 157,000 of the class we propose to disfranchise and he estimated that there would be about 30,000 of that class entitled to the franchise to-day. I think his estimate was about correct. According to the census, of 1911 there were in the prairie provinces 21,145 German males over 21 years of age, of whom 12,007 were naturalized. In the same provinces there were 57,750 Austro-Hungarians, of whom 23,846 were naturalized. This shows that in 1911 there were about 35,000 naturalized persons of the alien enemy class over 21 years of age in these provinces. There may have been additions since then, but on the other hand there would be subtractions to take into consideration. Therefore, I consider the estimate given by the hon. member for Saskatoon to be substantially correct.

Mr. BRADBURY: It is double now.

Mr. A. K. MACLEAN: I doubt very much if it is double now, because the number naturalized since 1911 has been very small indeed. True, there would be a certain number, but I deny the right of my hon. friend to say they have doubled.

Mr. BRADBURY: I am speaking from knowledge of my own county, and I say they have doubled.

Mr. A. K. MACLEAN: Canada is a little larger than the county represented by my hon. friend. In 1911 there were 12,007 Ger-

man males over 21 years of age naturalized in Canada. I doubt if the number has grown very much since. There would not be more than 5,000 or 6,000 Germans who would be voters in the western provinces, and I doubt if there would be as many as that. If that is correct, is it worth while violating so substantial a principle for the purpose of disfranchising that small number of electors, unless better cause can be shown for such an act. It must be remembered, also, that more than one-quarter of the German population in the Canadian Northwest came from the United States, a substantial number of whom were born in that country, and possibly their disfranchisement might be the cause of some international dispute, not of a serious nature, I grant you. I ask the Minister of Trade and Commerce, is this legislation worth while, for the sake of disfranchising such a few Germans, who may possibly be very good citizens, and a great number of whom may be quite sympathetic towards the cause of the Allied powers? The Germans in this country are different from the Germans in the British Isles, whom the Solicitor General says the British authorities deemed it not expedient to call upon for military service. Most of the Germans in this country came from the United States. The fact that they are settled upon the land and choose to come into this country to engage in an occupation of that character at once marks them as a type of people different from those who went from Germany to secure occupations in Great Britain. It is well known that the racial affinities of much of the Austrian population, which is the larger portion of the alien enemy population, are with the Russian people, and they are not known to be very sympathetic towards the Austrian Empire. If our political institutions were endangered by permitting these people to exercise the franchise, if these people of alien enemy origin were known to be hostile to Canada, to the British Empire and to the cause for which we now fight, if they showed acts of hostility in that direction; and if they were there in substantial numbers and so distributed that they could affect the result of an election in a number of constituencies, there might be something to be said in support of disfranchising them. It is not, however, necessary to defend them upon this score, because we have the favourable word of the Solicitor General upon this point. In introducing the Bill the other day, he said:

[Mr. A. K. Maclean.]

> I am quite free to admit that taken all in all those who come from alien enemy countries have, in the main, during the progress of the war, conducted themselves satisfactorily within lines of obedience to the laws of Canada.

And I thought he was rather apologetic in introducing the Bill. He did not unequivocally affirm his conviction as to the fairness of the Bill. He expressed himself in this way:

> It does not seem unreasonable that they should not exercise, during the war, that control of our destinies which is vested in the franchise.

Those were not strong words; they did not indicate a strong and intense conviction in the merits of the Bill. He simply thought it was not unreasonable. I am told my time is up, and unfortunately I must come to a stop before covering the ground I expected to cover. I hope, however, at another stage of this Bill to have an opportunity of concluding my remarks.

Mr. HUGH GUTHRIE (South Wellington): As I do not expect to be in the House when the vote is taken on this question, I would like to state my views in regard to the Bill now before the House. I voted for closure in regard to this measure, and on three or four occasions on Saturday night I voted against motions which I viewed as dilatory motions, only intended to retard the progress of the Bill, having regard to the fact that we are coming towards the close of the session. I am a supporter of the principle of the Bill, and, if I stand alone on this side of the House, I shall so vote if I am here when the vote is taken upon the second reading. In my judgment, the matter practically comes down to three questions. First, is the proposal to give the next of kin of soldiers serving overseas, or who have served overseas, a correct one? After listening to a good many speeches here to-day, I have come to the conclusion that there is no very great difference of opinion on either side of the House upon this question.

Mr. MURPHY: There is a lot of difference.

Mr. GUTHRIE: If there is a lot, I have not heard it voiced during the course of this debate. I rather concluded from what I heard that there was almost a consensus of opinion in regard to allowing the female next of kin of the soldiers abroad to vote at the coming election. I do not believe that it will be possible to poll anything like the full soldiers' vote. I do not believe that you can poll the votes of men actively en-

gaged upon the firing line, or the votes of men who are prisoners of Germany, or the votes of hundreds of men who are suffering pain and torment as the result of recently inflicted wounds—certainly you will not poll the votes of the thirty odd thousand men who have given their lives in this cause. For that reason, I am convinced that the proposal in this Bill to allow these men to be represented at the ensuing election is a proper one, and if it does not receive the support of both sides of the House, in my humble opinion it should receive it.

The next question raised by the Bill is that of disqualification. Upon this there seems to be rather a decided cleavage, those on your left taking the ground that it would be wrong, even as a war-time measure, to disfranchise men who have been granted the rights of citizenship in this country. And I agree that under ordinary conditions it would be nothing short of an outrage so to deprive them. But we must realise that we are not living under ordinary conditions, and extraordinary conditions require extraordinary measures. I have not had experience with what has been termed in this debate the alien vote which is resident in the North-west. By that I mean that class of people who have within the last fifteen years come to Canada from enemy countries and who have become naturalized citizens of Canada. I do not know them nor do they know me. But I am going to talk perhaps a little more candidly about some former residents of Germany whom I do know; and I do not know that there is any necessity to mince words on an occasion of this kind. I live in a county next to the county of Waterloo, and I believe from what I know and from what I have heard, and from what people in my county know, that the foreign-born German population of the county of Waterloo are not in sympathy with the objects of the Allies in the present war. I do not believe that in my county there are more than fifteen or twenty men who will be affected by the disfranchisement clause of this Bill; but I believe there are a large number in the adjoining county of Waterloo who will be disfranchised. I will give an instance. I have held meetings in Waterloo during the course of the present war, several of them patriotic meetings, Red Cross meetings, enlistment meetings. One I have clearly in my mind. It was held in the riding of North Waterloo, at Elmira. There was an audience of about 300 people in the small hall, almost all German either by birth or descent, the majority no doubt Canadian-born. I made my plea on behalf of the Patriotic Fund. My reception was rather frigid, but perhaps I did not put the case as well as I might have put it. However, at the conclusion of the meeting, a gentleman on the platform came to me and said: You must excuse us Mr. Guthrie, but take for instance myself; we are six brothers in my family, and five of us are in the Kaiser's army, and, he said, where should my sympathies be? Well, it was a very pertinent question. I could tell from the man's manner where his sympathies were, and it was only human nature when you come down to the last analysis. I put the case to myself—a Scotch-Canadian, suppose I were living in Germany to-day, unmolested by any law in Germany, where would my sympathies be? Entirely with the Allies. I believe that the highest responsibility cast on any citizen of this or any country is the duty of defending his country, and the highest privilege which the citizen can enjoy is the privilege of casting his franchise. On the one hand, you have the responsibility. But the aliens or the naturalized aliens in this country whom this Bill seeks to disfranchise are not permitted to defend this country, even if they so desired. Whether it is a military regulation of the British Government I do not know, but I have been informed that men of enemy birth are not permitted to serve in the ranks of the allied armies.

An hon. MEMBER: Fifty have gone from Ottawa.

Mr. GUTHRIE: I believe some have gone from Ottawa and some from my county, but I can tell you of some who went from Ottawa and my county, and that was the German reservists. My hon. friend says "not here." I have an instance, and I know it is correct, because a brother of mine has been chaplain in an Ottawa regiment. A German prisoner brought in seriously wounded, when my brother was called to him, turned to my brother and said: "Hello, Dr. Guthrie; I used to go to your church in Ottawa." And that man told my brother when he left Ottawa for the front. I believe there were a number of German reservists in Canada, and I believe that in many cases these were men who had taken the oath of allegiance to this country. We have had no serious outbreak in Canada—thank God for it—and I hope we may not; but if one reads the United States papers day by day he will see that the German people in that country have

been carrying out a most ingenious propaganda against the United States and in favour of Germany ever since the United States entered into the war. If that is so there, is it not likely to be so here? If the sympathy of the German residents of the United States is with the Central Powers, will the sympathy of the German people in this country not also be with the Central Powers? It is only human nature, and on that basis you have to deal with it. I do not believe that the men whom this Bill seeks to disfranchise will take serious offence in regard to it. I believe they will welcome it; I do not believe they want to be put in the delicate position of having to vote under the circumstances which affect them at the present time in Canada. No one believes this to be a permanent arrangement; this is purely and simply a war arrangement to avoid any difficulties which might arise, and for that reason I think it is proper that that portion of the Act should pass.

The only other point I see in the Bill is in regard to the women who are not enfranchised by this measure, certainly a very large number. I am a supporter of woman franchise for the whole of the Dominion of Canada, and I have not a doubt that, had there been time, that proposal might have been included in a Bill for the coming general election. But time has been otherwise occupied. We have been here month after month, and perhaps not a great deal has been accomplished; but certain it is that the House has been kept busy, aye very busy, early and late; and there has not been proper time to introduce general enfranchisement for the women of Canada. Five provinces, so far as their provincial affairs go, have placed Acts on their statute books to give women votes in provincial elections. Four provinces have not done so. Whether in these four provinces the great preponderance of opinion is against extending the franchise to women, I do not know. Certain it is that the country is about divided, half and half, in regard to women's votes. I think that this question of the enfranchisement of the women of the whole of Canada may well wait a year or two until matters of stern necessity with which we have now to deal have been successfully settled. I see no hardship in the Bill, no wrongful discrimination, and I have made up my mind to support it.

Mr. BICKERDIKE (Montreal, St-Lawrence): It is not my intention to deal with the Bill generally. I wish to confine myself principally to the clause by which we disfranchise some half a million of the very best women in Canada. I would not ask that any one opposed to the Allies, such as Germans, Austrians or Bulgarians should have the right to vote in this country, but I claim that every honest, loyal citizen in Canada should have the right to vote. Why should we discriminate to that extent? I think it would be well to state to the House what the law of New Zealand is. The section reads:

> Every adult person who has resided for one year in New Zealand and who has resided in the electoral district for which he claims to vote during the three months immediately preceding his resignation on the roll of the district, and who is a British subject either by birth or naturalization, or a half-caste, is entitled (subject to the provisions of this Act) to be registered as an elector and to vote at the election of members of Parliament for that district.

Every man and woman in New Zealand 21 years of age, who is a loyal British subject, has the right to vote. In the small country of Finland there is only one Chamber consisting of 200 members. The system of voting is known as direct and proportional. The Finns have equal suffrage, and some 18 or 20 women are members of the House. I certainly welcome this Bill, in as far as it permits a large number of women to vote at the next general election, but it does not go far enough. It is narrow, it is drastic, and savours largely of kaiserism. I must take exception to the clause restricting and limiting the votes of women in Canada, and insist on that clause being amended, so as to give to all women who are truly loyal British subjects, if they choose, the right of voting. I say that a serious injustice will be perpetrated if the Bill becomes law as it stands. Why should there be any discrimination against one form of national service and other forms of service equally honourable, equally indispensible to the prosecution of the war? For the first time in this country, a Bill has been introduced which ignores workers for the Red Cross, and the win-the-war nurses, the different patriotic fund workers, Belgian relief workers, and tens of thousands of women engaged in the munition factories who will, under this measure be denied the right to vote. This Bill should be amended so as to confer equal political rights on women. We should give the loyal women of Canada the same political rights and privileges as are enjoyed by the men, with power to fill any office at the constitutional disposal of the Crown; and furthermore, to

become candidates, and if elected to take their seats in this House of Commons. Then, and only then, will the reforms so long advocated in this House by a number of the members become law. Penitenitary and prison reforms ably advocated by the hon. member for Frontenac (Mr. Edwards). reform in the liquor traffic by our good friend from Bonaventure (Mr. Marcil), and last, but not least, abolishing of the death penalty in Canada. You are depriving of the vote by this Bill five hundred thousand truly loyal Canadian women, who have been doing all this good work ever since the war commenced. It is, to say the least of it, an autocratic, undignified measure and unworthy of any government of this great Dominion. I cannot understand how any government resort to such a subterfuge under the guise of a war-time election Act, and I hope that the right hon. leader of the Government (Sir Robert Borden) will accept my suggestion, and amend this clause. If he does not do so, I am sure he will regret it for years to come; and on the other hand, if he accepts my suggestion he will be able to look back upon this measure with pride, pleasure and satisfaction.

I must quote what President Wilson has just said in a message to the people of the state of Maine. It is an evidence that all over the civilized world women are going to get the vote, and get it soon. He said:

> May I not express through you my very great interest in the equal suffrage campaign in Maine? The pledges of my party are very distinct in favour of granting the suffrage to women by state action, and I would like to have the privilege of urging all Democrats to support a cause in which we all believe.

We are going very far away in this Bill from our democratic principle. I remember, in my young days, we used to say we were democratic—yes, "democrats to the hilt"—but there is nothing of a democratic nature in this Bill. The opinion of the people of Vancouver on this feature of the Bill is indicated by the following newspaper despatch:

> Vancouver, September 7.—The Vancouver Trades and Labour Council last evening passed a motion protesting against the manner in which the Dominion Government intends to extend a part franchise to women, and calling upon Premier Borden to give all women of the Dominion full privileges at the polls with men.

We have the following communication from Winnipeg:

> Winnipeg, September 8.—"I am absolutely opposed to it," declared R. A. Rigg, secretary of the Trades and Labour Council, in referring to the new franchise legislation. "The country is falling into the grip of autocratic rule. The last semblance of democracy is vanishing. If they continue along the lines they are now following, autocracy will undoubtedly be firmly established in this country."

In Montreal several associations have had meetings, and resolved on sending petitions to the Government and have passed resolutions opposing the Bill as it stands to-day. I will refer to one case. The People's Power League and Equal Suffrage League met last Thursday night, and the following is a report of the proceedings:

> The resolution submitted by the Equal Suffrage League deprecated the idea of differentiating between one form of national service and other forms of service equally honourable and equally indispensable to a successful prosecution of the war, and that for the first time in this country a Bill has been introduced which ignores workers for the Red Cross, Red Cross Nurses, Patriotic Fund Committees, Belgian and similar relief funds, also the tens of thousands of women engaged in munition factories, etc., who are denied the vote. It was also pointed out that many undesirable analogies will develop, and that it does not take advantage of the present psychological moment to confer upon women equal political rights with men, and that the British House of Commons and the United States have made no such distinctions in their recent franchise legislation.
>
> It was, therefore, resolved, "That this meeting implores the advisers of the Crown to withdraw their Franchise Bill and draft immediately a measure that will invest women with the same political rights and privileges as are shared by men, with power to fill any office at the constitutional disposal of the Crown."

Here is one of the statements made at that meeting:

> As regards the votes given to all female relatives of soldiers, nobody would grumble with that if adult suffrage for all women were established. But a slur is cast on every woman who may be without soldier relatives, and she is declared unfit to exercise the franchise! Why? What is the special reason for singling out a special class of women voters? It is not any frank recognition of woman suffrage, but as Mr. Meighen says, "to give added strength to the vote of the soldiers of Canada." Thus to 400,000 soldier votes will be added from half a million to a million soldiers' relatives' votes —a special class that no doubt the Conservative Government feel can be specially appealed to by being told the ridiculous rubbish that the soldiers at the front will be deserted if they do not all vote Conservative.

I appeal to the Government on behalf of these women who are doing so much good work. I will cite two concrete cases with a view to touching the heart of the Secretary of State, if I can.

An hon. MEMBER: It cannot be done.

Mr. BICKERDIKE: I know a woman in Montreal with whom the Solicitor General also is very well acquainted. I have personal knowledge of the facts in this matter, because I have a son who is a major

in the 87th Grenadier Guards, a regiment which was raised by my hon. friend's cousin, General Meighen. The lady to whom I refer, who has no sons, gathered around her a number of workers in Montreal, and they sent 6,000 pairs of socks, all knitted by these loving hands, to that regiment. Is it fair to deny the vote to these women, who have been doing real service for the boys at the front, the sons of other mothers? I say that it is unjust, unreasonable, unpatriotic. In addition to the 6,000 pairs of socks, they sent over one hundred thousand soldiers' comforts of one kind or another. The Government did not pay for these; the ladies collected the money and sent the articles to the front. I submit that such women are entitled to the vote. Another woman had three daughters, and when the war broke out the very first thing she did was to say to them: come with me. Thereupon she and her daughters started working night and day collecting money for the Red Cross and Patriotic Funds. Has that woman not a right to vote? I do hope that the Prime Minister and the Secretary of State will reconsider the drastic measure that they have submitted to the House, and will decide to treat all the loyal, earnest and patriotic women of Canada as they should be treated.

Mr. FRANK GLASS (East Middlesex): Mr. Speaker, we scarcely expected that this Bill would meet with the unanimous consent of members of the House. I have almost come to the conclusion that it is practically impossible for the Government to introduce any measure or to suggest any legislation that would be entirely satisfactory to the members of the Opposition. It has been said that "only the dead are satisfied; they would not be if they were conscious of their dissatisfaction."

The hon. gentleman who has just resumed his seat (Mr. Bickerdike), with other members of the Opposition, has paid great attention to the word "democracy," and has endeavoured to show by various means how in this measure democracy is being assailed. The very foundation of democracy requires that equal rights demand equal service. If we are seeking an exemplification of equal service as we should have it we shall not find it in the attitude of the Opposition during the whole course of this session; indeed, during the whole course of the war. The late Elbert Hubbard at one time defined democracy as follows:

1. A form of government by popular ignorance.

[Mr. Bickerdike.]

2. The fool's paradise.

3. Any political system where male votes are a substitute for brains.

He had this further to say about the word democracy:

The word is from the word abracadabra; demo, lungs, and crazy; hence, to rule by caloric.

Democracy is defined in the Standard dictionary as follows:

The political system in which government is directly controlled by the people collectively through elected representatives.

Nicholas Murray Butler, in his work "True and False Democracy," defines both. He says:

Jealousy of power honestly gained and justly exercised, envy of attainment or possession are characteristic of the mob, not of the people; of a democracy which is false, not of a democracy which is true. False democracy shouts every man down to the level of the average. True democracy cries all men up to the heights of their fullest capacity for service and achievement. The two sides are everlastingly at war. The future of this nation as the future of the world is bound up with the hope of a true democracy that builds itself on liberty.

My hon. friend has shown a very keen interest in the unfortunate position of the women of our country, who, he says, as a result of this Bill, will be deprived of the franchise. It was clearly shown this afternoon that what woman has never had she cannot lose. She has not had the franchise in this country so far—but I re-echo the sentiments that various hon. gentlemen have expressed: the franchise should be extended to women throughout the whole Dominion. The time will come when this privilege will be extended to all our women. How does woman view this measure? I have before me a copy of the London Free Press in which are given interviews with several women. Amongst others, there is an interview with Mrs. Gordon Wright, a prominent leader in all social work, who is practically known internationally, and who has devoted a great deal of her time and energies to women's work throughout the country. Mrs. Gordon Wright is the sister of Hon. Newton Wesley Rowell, leader of the Opposition in the provincial legislature. She was interviewed in reference to this measure, and this is her reply:

Mrs. Gordon Wright, sister of Mr. N. W. Rowell, leader of the Provincial Opposition, holds the strongest views on the subject, and considers that the proposals of Premier Borden are only just and reflect the greatest credit on the party.

"I think that it is perfectly right that only these women who have endured the anxiety of having soldier relatives at the front should

vote," she said, in reply to a question as to whether or not she considered that the Bill should be extended to all women, particularly such women as have no male relatives eligible for soldiers.

"I think that the Bill ought to go further and disfranchise all the men who ought to be at the front but who are not there. No slackers should be allowed to vote," she concluded.

Other women in the city were interviewed, and some of them expressed similar sentiments. Hon. gentlemen have said there is an object in this enfranchisement of women. Of course there is an object. That object is to do justice to the large vote of those soldiers who are at the front, and who will never have an opportunity of exercising the franchise; and, as has been stated to-day, to do justice to the memory of those 30,000 soldiers who have made the last sacrifice, who are silent, who cannot express their views at this time, to the thousands of those unfortunate prisoners at present in Germany enduring hardships and trials, to the wounded, sick and suffering in the hospitals, not only in France and Great Britain but even in our own country, and to those who, by reason of the horrors of this war and the consequent strain on their nerves, have become insane, and who are now confined in hospitals for the insane in this country as well as in the Old Land. Do we not owe a tribute to the memory of those? Do we not owe a duty to those who are still enduring hardships, who will not be able in this election to exercise their personal influence? Should we not, therefore, endeavour to carry out the aims and objects for which they are fighting? Hon. gentlemen opposite do not offer any serious objection to the granting of the franchise to the female relatives of the soldiers, but they say: There is a purpose in not extending that franchise to the rest of the women. Certainly there is a purpose. It would be eminently unjust to those who have lent their sons to fight in defence of their country, to those who have male relatives at the front, if the benefit of the votes of the female relatives of soldiers should be neutralized by the extension of the franchise to those women whose sympathies are not along the same lines. It is for this reason I can see a certain advantage in restricting the franchise at the present time to those women who have relatives serving at the front. The Secretary of State (Mr. Meighen), in introducing this Bill, pointed out those who would be deprived of the exercise of the franchise in this election. He said:

There are as well many thousands who are enlisted overseas, not in the Canadian overseas forces, but in the British forces. These men, though under the Military Voters' Act, they have, I understand, been given the right to vote, will inevitably in the main find it impossible to exercise that right. There are, besides, many thousands more who before the war were reservists in Canada—and some who were not reservists—who are to-day fighting in Europe or other continents the same battle in which we are engaged, but who are doing so as members of the Allied armies. They have not the legal right to vote; if they had it, they could not possibly exercise the franchise. An election is to be held at a time when the most deserving, the bone, sinew and virility of our country, are only partially at least enabled to take part in the contest by way of voting. There are also thousands who have fallen in battle, whose voices are stilled. There are, besides these, some thousands who are prisoners of war. Their voices also are silent; under no imaginable circumstances could they take advantage of the Military Voters' Act.

Further on he pointed out—and this was referred to by the Prime Minister this afternoon:

Nor can we forget what is a more potent fact still; that each and all of the men overseas are stripped of the influence which under normal circumstances they could exert among their fellows in an election contest.

It has been pointed out that, in so far as the alien vote is concerned, it affects more particularly those portions of Canada that we know as the western provinces. As has been shown, there are some 12,007 German voters out of a total male population of 21,145 naturalised Germans, and that there are 23,846 Austro-Hungarian voters out of a total male population of 57,750, or a total of 35,853 voters. If we had adopted the principle adopted by one of the western provinces, of classifying these men together and giving them three representatives, the same as they did with the soldiers, they would not be a great factor or influence in the politics of this country or in this House. This Government is pursuing a wiser course, as I am more thoroughly convinced after hearing the remarks of my hon. friend from South Wellington (Mr. Guthrie), who speaks from his knowledge and experience of the fact that alien enemy reservists, who had taken the oath of naturalization of this country, had responded to the call of their mother country and had returned in order to fight against our soldiers in the trenches. We have read the record in the press of a German who was taken prisoner, who was a Canadian citizen from one of the cities of Saskatchewan. He was a naturalized British subject, a German who had taken the oath of allegiance

and who, to all intents and purposes, had accepted the conditions of nationality in this country. Yet he was taken prisoner from the German army at the front. We cannot get away from these facts which are presented to us. If there be one, if there be two, if there be a dozen, there is no reason why there may not be thousands of such men, and there is every reason to presume that those people of the same nationality, who were reservists and whose sympathies are naturally on the side of the country of their birth, would find that their affection for their native land was stronger than their affection for their adopted country. Because we believe that, these men are not to be allowed to be conscripted into our army. Then upon what ground can these men who can give no service to the State in an emergency of this kind claim the right to vote under the extraordinary conditions which we have to face at the present time? My hon. friend has said that this is not a win-the-war, but a win-the-election Bill. Personally, I do not see any great distinction, because winning the war, so far as Canada is concerned, means putting forth our maximum effort in order to bring the war to a successful conclusion, and I conceive that a government under the leadership of my right hon. friend who is now leader of the Opposition (Sir Wilfrid Laurier) would adopt a policy calculated to bring about results the very reverse of that.

I just wish to quote from the report of a meeting which was held in Calgary on May 17 last, at which Premier Sifton was one of the principal speakers:

> Premier Sifton declared at the opening meeting of the provincial election here last night that all subjects of alien birth who were naturalized before August 4, 1914, and who had in no way committed any offence against the laws of Canada since, would have the right to vote in the Alberta election.
>
> There was a meeting of five or six thousand electors, many of them being soldiers who had returned from the front. Sergt.-Major Guillfoyle, one of the returned soldiers, was given ten minutes to address the meeting, and he at once asked the Premier why he had not taken action towards disfranchising all Germans and Austrians in the province. His question was the signal for shouting and applause among the soldiers in the audience.
>
> The veterans claimed Canada was still in very real danger from these men, who were far more numerous than was generally believed, and who were now to have the right to vote.
>
> The Premier, he said, had the opportunity during the last session of the Legislature to bring in a Bill disfranchising the Germans and Austrians, but he did not do so. Turning to the Premier on the platform, he said: "I impeach you as failing to do the right thing for the country in this, and challenge you that you cannot make a reply that will be satisfactory to the citizens of this city."
>
> Regarding the changing of the law affecting the franchise to subjects of alien birth, the Premier said the proposal that this should be done was not made till it was too late for the legislature to take it up, and it was a matter with which only the legislature could deal.

I quote this to show that in that part of the country where the majority of these alien enemies are to be found, the soldiers who have lived side by side with them, and have therefore a better opportunity of judging them than we have here, find that they are not reliable.

I shall support this measure because I believe that its purpose is in the best interests of this country. Its purpose implies that Canada will continue with all her might and main to support our soldiers at the front till this war is brought to a finish. I believe it would be a great injustice to the memory of those who have made the supreme sacrifice, if those of alien birth in this country were allowed at this particular time to exercise the franchise and to use their influence while our men are engaged in the vital duties they are performing at the front.

10 p.m.

Mr. J. M. DOUGLAS (Strathcona): There are quite a number of objectionable features in this Bill. As far as the question of enfranchising the wives and daughters, and sisters of the soldiers is concerned, I heartily support that particular provision of the Bill. I wish it had gone further and that the Parliament of Canada had enfranchised every woman who is a British subject, following the lead which has been given in that direction by the western provinces.

The feature of the Bill to which I object most strongly is the disfranchisement of what is called the alien enemy in this country. In the province from which I come, and in the constituency which I represent, there is a large number of so-called alien enemies, and from my knowledge of these people I take issue with any hon. gentleman on the other side of the House who states that these men are alien enemies in the strict sense of the word. I have watched their conduct ever since 1914; I have come in contact with them, and I say that in no act that I have ever seen has there been any justification for the charge that the Austrian and German in western Canada is disloyal. He certainly gives voice to no such utterances as I have heard in eastern Canada, and if the basis of this

franchise is war service, I think a great many of the people in the eastern portion of Canada should be disfranchised before these so-called alien enemies in the West. We have tremendous natural resources in Canada; we have a wonderful country, which needs, above everything else, population. We have embarked upon a comprehensive scheme for inducing people to settle with us and become citizens. We have offered every inducement, and our policy had been successful up to the beginning of this war. We have induced great numbers of people from all parts of Europe and the United States to come over and assist in making this a great country. We have given pledges to these people that, provided they would settle among us and behave themselves, Parliament would grant them the franchise and every other privilege a British citizen enjoys. That has been the secret of the splendid record of Great Britain as the most successful colonizing nation in the world. Britain has never attempted coercion in any country which she has conquered. She has never attempted coercion against any people whom she has induced to come and settle within her borders. From my knowledge of these people whom it is proposed to disfranchise, I know they have been a very important factor in the upbuilding of this Dominion, and in the prosperity of the western part of the Dominion. They have proven most excellent settlers, most peaceable neighbours, and a very honest, industrious and frugal people, who are transforming the country from a wild state into one of the most prosperous and productive sections in the whole Dominion.

We have endeavoured to get these men here on the promise that if they came they should enjoy all the privileges which we give to the native-born Canadian or the native-born Britisher. And now, through no fault of theirs, with a stroke of the pen, we are depriving them of this privilege. We are branding them in a way as outcasts, and casting a reflection upon their loyalty, which, as some one remarked here this afternoon, will not be wiped out in this generation, but will probably be carried down for fifty years to come. From the point of view of unity, this is a most serious thing to do. In Western Canada particularly, our population is necessarily of a very cosmopolitan character. We are endeavouring by every means to unite the different nationalities into one common citizenship, and I take the view that we have succeeded very well in my province. We have only one system of schools, and the German, the Ruthenian, the Galician and the Pole has to send his children to our schools. They have to learn English, and, to give them only due credit, they are most excellent linguists. Within a very short time after arriving in the country they become quite proficient in the language. They are falling into our customs, they are doing as we do, they are dressing as we dress, and they are assimilating themselves in every way to the pattern of the Canadian people and are becoming excellent citizens. My hon. friend from East Middlesex (Mr. Glass) quoted an article from a newspaper stating that Premier Sifton of Alberta had made a speech in Calgary which had not met with the reception it might have received from some returned soldiers in that city. I happen to know Sergeant Guillfoyle, who spoke after Premier Sifton, and from my knowledge of him I would not give credence to one word he said, no matter on what subject he was speaking.

Mr. R. B. BENNETT: He was only willing to die, that is all. He offered to die.

Mr. DOUGLAS: A great many men offered to die—

Mr. R. B. BENNETT: But, he was in France.

Mr. DOUGLAS: —I am sorry to say my hon. friend from Calgary (Mr. R. B. Bennett) was not one of them.

Mr. R. B. BENNETT: He did not put a uniform on for a summer, and draw pay.

Mr. SPEAKER: Order.

Mr. DOUGLAS: As far as Mr. Guillfoyle's energies in connection with the provincial campaign were concerned, I think he only lasted a short time when he was forced to resume his position in some other walk of life. He is an agitator. He certainly tried to defend his country, and probably did everything he could along that line. Still he was not a pronounced success in an election. Mention has been made here of what the foreign-born people have done in the matter of contributions to the Patriotic Fund. I took part in a meeting east of Edmonton last year, where the population was entirely of Austrian birth——

Mr. R. B. BENNETT: Is that the meeting you attended in uniform?

Mr. DOUGLAS: No, I attended that meeting in civilian clothes. The other meeting was not a Patriotic Fund meeting.

An hon. MEMBER: Cheap stuff.

Mr. SPEAKER: Order:

Mr. DOUGLASS: I want to tell the House that those men responded splendidly to the appeal for contributions to the Patriotic Fund, and that the constituency of Whitford, represented in the provincial house by an Austrian, contributed more to the Patriotic Fund than any other constituency in the province of Alberta. Those men were most anxious to enlist. My hon. friend from Edmonton (Mr. Oliver) made the statement that one-half of the 218th Battalion was made up of men of Galician or Austrian birth. I have personal knowledge of the facts, and I think my hon. friend is quite within the mark in that statement. To show the earnestness with which these men endeavoured to enlist, I might say they nearly all had to perjure themselves in order to become members of that battalion. They had to swear they were Russians, yet to my own knowledge the majority of those men never saw Russia, came from Austria. Still, they were so eager to go and fight against Austria that they enlisted claiming they came from Russia. The 192nd Battalion from the Crowsnest Pass, was largely made up of the same class of people, taken from the mines of Blairmore district, and that south-west country. So that the charge that these men were not prepared to do their duty and take the full responsibility of citizenship is absolutely unfounded. If they had been given an opportunity of enlisting and joining our forces under the volunteer system, we could easily have had a full battalion of men of that race.

I was much struck with a statement I read just recently, showing the feeling with which this question of blending and making a cosmopolitan community of blended people was viewed by no less a person than General Smuts. Speaking in London quite recently, he said:

> We want to create a blend out of various nationalities. We want to create a new nation, and that is the South African nation. If we succeed in doing that we shall achieve a nation not standing on one leg, but on various legs. We shall have a nation which will embrace various traits. You will have a people all blending into one. It is only by bringing about a union like that, and by making the different racial types of people work together, respect each other, co-operate with each other, and understand each other, that you will bring into being a unanimous people which will take the broadest and largest view of the problems with which it is confronted.

These sentiments breathe the spirit of broadness, and show that the idea of cementing the people and nationalizing and colonizing is deep in the heart of that great Boer general, who not many years ago was fighting against Great Britain, and who today occupies one of the most responsible positions in South Africa. I understand the Prime Minister was at conference with this same general, and that those expressions were voiced at that conference, yet we find the Prime Minister coming back to Canada and at this late stage of the session bringing down a Bill which will have the very opposite effect to that voiced by General Smuts, an effect which will create discord and disunion in this country, at a time when feeling is running high, when everything should be done to minimize differences and quiet people rather than the reverse. I regret very much that at this time of tremendous stress, when people's nerves are on edge, there is introduced into this Parliament a measure which is going to create such dissatisfaction and feeling, because of the fact that an absolute injustice is being done to a large part of the population of this country.

Mr. D. D. McKENZIE (Cape Breton North and Victoria): Mr. Speaker, the time at my disposal is very short. I must, in the first place, make complaint against the Government that this Bill was only two hours under discussion when the closure was applied. It is a Bill of far-reaching and great importance, and I think we should have been given at least a day in which to discuss it before the application of closure. Instead of that, one-half the members of this House had no opportunity to speak upon the Bill under the ordinary rules. We reached the discussion of the Bill at ten o'clock on Satuday night, and at a quarter to twelve the closure was applied. I submit, therefore, that no great freedom or opportunity was given to the representatives of the people to deal with this most important question.

With you, Sir, I come from a province where the greatest possible freedom has been given to the people in connection with the exercise of the franchise, and where every opportunity is given to the electors or to any people entitled to be electors to have their names put upon the list; and the greatest possible hesitancy is exercised in depriving any of them of the right to the franchise, after their names have been placed upon the list. In the province of Nova Scotia we were accustomed to the amplest provisions for putting names on the list, and if necessary striking off the

names of those who had no right to vote. One has practically every day from the 20th of January to the 5th of March for putting names on and the same period for striking names off at the Revisers' Court, which is held annually on the 5th of March in each year; and if any person has reason to complain of the conduct of the revisers he has a right to appeal to the Sheriff's Court in each county, the provisions for that appeal being found in sections 25 to 28, both inclusive, of chapter 4 of the Revised Statutes of Nova Scotia, 1900. The revisers are appointed by the representatives of the people in the municipal councils of the different counties in the province, and are thus answerable to the public for their conduct, and are subject to penalties for any malfeasance of office as will appear from sections 39 to 42, both inclusive, of chapter 4 of the Revised Statutes of Nova Scotia, 1900. Subsection B of section 40 reads:

> Every reviser who neglects to revise any of the lists of voters for the revisal section of which he is a reviser, or wilfully transmits to the clerk of the municipal district any incorrect list of voters, shall be liable to a penalty of two hundred dollars.

Subsection (2) of section 40 provides that each day a list is delayed shall be a separate offence.

Section 41 provides that every sheriff who wilfully neglects any duty imposed on such sheriff by this chapter, or places on a list of voters the name of any person not properly qualified, or strikes off any such list the name of any person properly qualified, shall be liable to a penalty of two hundred dollars.

And although the Act, that is, the Franchise Act for Nova Scotia, does not provide imprisonment for any of those offences, yet the general law, as found in subsection B of section 48 of chapter 161 of the Revised Statutes of Nova Scotia, 1900, provides as follows:—

> (b) That in default of payment of the said penalty, compensation, or sum of money, and costs, if any, forthwith or within a limited time, the defendant be imprisoned in the manner and for the time mentioned in the said statute or law, or for any period not exceeding three months, if the statute or law authorizing the conviction or order does not specify imprisonment, or does not specify any term of imprisonment, unless the said sums with the like costs and expenses are sooner paid.

If these officers do not discharge their duty, they are subject to the serious fines, or to imprisonment. I find that the Act now before this House provides no such penalty, although the officers who are to be appointed are not to be appointed directly by the Government or by any person who has responsibility for their actions.

I wish to point out, in the earlier part of my remarks, that the Naturalization Act of Canada gives very strong inducement for people coming into Canada to become naturalized. The provisions of our Naturalization Act afford ample protection to the foreigners who may become British subjects under the provisions of that Act. Section 24 of chapter 77, Revised Statutes of Canada, 1906, reads as follows:—

> An alien to whom a certificate of naturalization is granted shall, within Canada, be entitled to all political and other rights, powers and privileges, and be subject to all obligations, to which a natural-born British subject is entitled or subject within Canada, with this qualification, that he shall not, when within the limits of the foreign state of which he was a subject previously to obtaining his certificate of naturalization, be deemed to be a British subject, unless he has ceased to be a subject of that state in pursuance of the laws thereof or in pursuance of a treaty or convention to that effect.

I read this to show that the Act which is now before the House does not propose to repeal this Naturalization Act, and the Naturalization Act gives to every man who comes into this country and qualifies for naturalization every privilege of a British subject. The contract is made with him by this House, by the Senate, and by the King, that when he comes here and is naturalized, he is, to all intents and purposes, the same as ourselves, and that right is secured to him by statute. The men whom we are dealing with here, so far as we have evidence, have done their duty, but we are not keeping our part of the contract. It is an old saying that "The subject who is truly loyal to the chief magistrate will neither advise nor submit to arbitrary measures." In this case also the old saying applies, that whatever we sow the same shall we reap. The Canadian people, in giving this party power, have sown the wind and they are certainly, in this particular Act, reaping the whirlwind. I submit that when we think of the practices and performances of the party now behind the Government and of the Government itself since 1911, we must not be surprised that we have this action of theirs and this Act before the House. When we recall, Sir, that in 1911, while the party of hon. gentlemen opposite professed to be super-loyal and were waving and flapping the flag and yelling loyalty all over the country, men of that great party were financing a paper and a speaker in the

province of Quebec who were not devoting much of their time to loyalty, we must not be very much surprised at what we find on this occasion.

We have been told by the Secretary of State that there was only one qualification for voters in this country and that the franchise could only be properly exercised by those giving service in the war. I submit that that statement is absolutely unconstitutional. In this country the powers and privileges of Parliament, and the functions which the representatives of the people are permitted to perform, are divided into two sections, one section to be dealt with by this Parliament, and the other by the local legislatures. The powers of the Dominion Parliament are set forth in section 91 of the British North America Act which reads:

> It shall be lawful for the Queen, by and with the advice and consent of the Senate and House of Commons, to make laws for the peace, order and good government of Canada, in relation to all matters not coming within the classes of subjects by this Act assigned exclusively to the Legislatures of the provinces; and for greater certainty, but not so as to restrict the generality of the foregoing terms of this section, it is hereby declared that (notwithstanding anything in this Act) the exclusive legislative authority of the Parliament of Canada extends to all matters coming within the classes of subjects next hereinafter enumerated, that is to say:
>
> The public debt and property; the regulation of trade and commerce; the raising of money by any mode or system of taxation; the borrowing of money on the public credit; postal service; the census and statistics; militia, military and naval service and defence; the fixing of and providing for the salaries and allowances of civil and other officers of the Government of Canada; beacons, buoys, lighthouses and Sable Island; navigation and shipping; quarantine and the establishment and maintenance of marine hospitals; sea coast and inland fisheries; ferries between a province and any British or foreign country, or between two provinces; currency and coinage; banking; incorporation of banks and the issue of paper money; savings banks; weights and measures; bills of exchange and promissory notes; interest; legal tender; bankruptcy and insolvency; patents of inventions and discovery; copyrights; Indians and lands reserved for the Indians; naturalization and aliens; marriage and divorce; the criminal law, except the constitution of the courts of criminal jurisdiction, but including the procedure in criminal matters; the establishment, maintenance and management of penitentiaries; such classes of subjects as are expressly excepted in the enumeration of the classes of subjects by this Act assigned exclusively to the Legislatures of the provinces.

Those are the many subjects which the people of this country are given the right to deal with by their representatives in this House. But we are told by the Solicitor General that all these subjects must be put to one side, and that the people of this country have nothing to say as to the class of representatives they will have to represent them, and they must only have men who give all their time and attention to questions of the war, and not to anything else. I submit that there is no justification as far as the Government is concerned, for introducing this new Act, and making these wide departures from the old condition of things that existed before the war or that existed up to the time that the Government received the extension of one year. I submit to you, Sir, that, if this Government had declared to the people of Canada, when they asked for the extension of one year, that they were going to introduce a drastic measure like this, no sane man who had anything to say in granting that extension would have consented to it but would have held them down to the proper procedure. Had that been done the people, before this date, would have had an opportunity of passing judgment upon the Government. We profess to be fighting for freedom. Indeed, we are fighting for freedom, and for the establishment of the rights of the common people. Why, then, are we called upon to commit this very high act of tyranny, which is before this House? The proper rule is that, as far as the vote is concerned, there should be one vote for one man. That has been the practice in this country, and that is the practice in recent years in England, although there have been abuses of that principle for many years in that country. We depart from the traditions and principles of British institutions in disfranchising our fellow citizens and depriving them of the right and privileges which they have freely enjoyed. We are all for the war, for the King and for the flag. Where is the candidate going to be found from whom we have to expect any danger should he find his way into this House? The only danger that we have to protect ourselves against is that members may find their way into this House who will not be as true and as loyal to the subject with which we have to deal as ourselves. I have not heard a hint that any provision is to be made as to the class of candidate we shall have, and the blow is struck at the poor people, who should have the right to poll their votes in support of the institution which we are so proud to possess.

Why is there such fear about a change of membership in this House? The Government now have passed all the legislation

that they can possibly hope for. They have the War Measures Act, they have the War Profits Act, they have the Income Tax, the Soldiers' Vote Act, Conscription Act, Canadian Northern Act, the Quebec and Saguenay Act, the Overseas Militia Act, the Minister of Militia's Act, the Under Secretary of State's Act—every Act that the mind of man can think of they have within their power. I hope and believe that they have no part or parcel in the Acts of the Apostles. With all this machinery, why fear to face the people? Let them give a proper vote, and allow the people to pass judgment on the conduct of this Government. We scorn, Sir, the political methods of the Turk or the Mexican. How are they worse than we are, if we follow the principle laid down in this Bill in our dealings with those who have come into our country and whom we have made British subjects. If there is anything wrong with the men in the West, or in other parts of Canada, who may exercise the franchise under the old conditions, we have no evidence of it. This Government has been delighted to appoint commissions for every conceivable act that could possibly be thought of. They were always switching aside to some commission anything and everything that they should decide themselves. But here is one of the biggest issues that has been dealt with, or can be dealt with, by the Government—the question whether or not these people had the right to vote—and instead of sending a man to ascertain the true facts, or making any investigation, they simply pass judgment without any evidence, condemn those men unheard, deprive them of their rights without giving them the slightest hint or reason as to why the thing is being done, except that, as has been pointed out by the hon. member for Edmonton (Mr. Oliver), it is thought they may vote Liberal. The soldier who fights for his country is doing his duty, and is doing it well, and he is certainly entitled to the first rank of citizenship. But he is not doing any more than his duty, and, as a citizen, as far as the vote is concerned, there is no law and there never was a law in any British country where a soldier or any citizen, no matter how admirable he may be, was given more than one vote. We have the foundation of the principle in our constitution, that the King can do no wrong. That fortunately is still true, but it is a sad thing to believe in this country the same cannot safely and truthfully be said of those who advise the King. The Government promised those men full rights of citizenship if they came into this country, but the trouble is, sad to relate, that those promises were ignored; and, as I have already stated, without the slightest notice and without the slightest opportunity of defending themselves the people are being deprived of that right.

Mr. DAVIDSON: I rise to a point of order. I wish to call attention to the fact that the hon. gentleman is reading his speech.

Mr. McKENZIE: I have a few notes, and I am passing over them rapidly. I think it is rather a small business to deprive me of the right to refer to notes.

Mr. SPEAKER: The hon. member is acquainted with the rule. Under the rule a member is not permitted to read his speech, but is allowed to refer to notes.

Mr. McKENZIE: I will be pleased to pass my notes over to you, Mr. Speaker, to show you that they are simply notes. I am sorry to say that it is a Nova Scotian who takes exception to anything of this kind, for the first time in 14 years I have been in this House; but I can only say that the mantle falls on deserving shoulders.

I was going to say, certain emissaries went forth from this country to the West to ask certain gentleman to cast their lot with this Government, and come under the Tory yoke. But, as they would not submit to the Tory yoke; as they would not come within the thraldom of Toryism, the next thing was to subject them to this law: to have them gagged, pilloried, outlawed. That is what is being done by this Bill. The Government says, sometimes boastfully, that they are willing to submit themselves to the judgment of the people. Their courage in offering to submit themselves to the judgment of the people is akin to that of the man who boasts of going into the lion's cage after he has had all the lion's teeth removed, his claws cut off, and his eyes gouged out. That is the courageous manner in which the Government proposes to go before the people. They say that they will win the election; they boast about it. Well, if they win it, it will be because of their having seized their antagonist and tied his hands behind him. That is the extent of the courage and bravery of hon. gentlemen opposite in offering to submit themselves to the people and in boasting of their expectation to secure the majority of the votes.

I warn the Government that in dealing with the foreigners as they propose under

this Bill, they are striking a blow at the principle of freedom. Many of these men, when they came here, were led to believe that British justice, British fair-play, British privileges, prevailed in this land, and that they would have the advantages of all these. When it is known that tyranny rules, the stream of immigration into this country will be diverted to other channels. We have heard a great deal of Canada becoming an adjunct of the United States. I submit that no stronger step could be taken than has been taken by the Government towards making this country an adjunct of some country in which freedom has not been flung to the winds. If an improper spirit develops in this country after this measure is passed, hon. gentlemen opposite will know what brought about that condition, and they will have themselves to blame. We boast of our freedom, of our spirit of fair play, of our treatment of the people who come amongst us. Then why brand as cowards those people who come to our country at our invitation, to whom we have extended the right hand of fellowship, whom we have welcomed under the benign and munificent folds of the British flag? Shall we brand these people as men who are unworthy of confidence? I hope that it is not too late to save our good name, to stand steadily upon the rock-bottom principles of freedom, fortitude and fidelity, to be true and firm for our God, our King and our country.

Mr. ARTHUR B. COPP (Westmorland): It will be admitted, Sir, that no legislation coming before Parliament is of deeper interest to the people than legislation dealing with their franchise. It is the duty of every citizen to go to the polls when the occasion demands and exercise the franchise which it is his privilege to enjoy. The people, therefore, are watching carefully and with a great deal of interest the Bill that is now before Parliament. This measure is composed of practically two parts; one, the disfranchisement of a certain number of electors; the other, the enfranchisement of a certain portion of the population. The Secretary of State, when introducing this measure, stated that one of the purposes of the Bill was to disfranchise certain persons of alien enemy birth, practically all of whom resided in the western provinces. Personally I have little if any knowledge of these people. I was particularly impressed with the very careful, logical and thoughtful remarks made with regard to those people by the member for Saskatoon (Mr. McCraney). I am sure that nobody would charge that hon. gentleman with making a partisan speech on this subject; he spoke as he felt. He referred to the people of that western country who —some many years ago, others not so long ago—took upon themselves the duties of Canadian citizenship. He said that they had conducted themselves as loyal and patriotic citizens during the whole of the time that they had been in this country, including the past three years, while the war had been in progress.

The Secretary of State said that one of the reasons why he introduced this measure was because a large portion of the population in the western provinces desired that they should be disfranchised in order that they might not have to vote in the forthcoming election. They stated, he said, that if they had the franchise some question might arise as to their loyalty. That was the only reason advanced by the Secretary of State for the disfranchisement of these people. Well, any elector who feels that way can refrain from voting; it is not necessary to take from him the right to exercise the franchise.

My hon. friend says that this is a war-time measure; that the Act will operate only during the period of the war and the period of demobilization thereafter. But, however much we may regret it, we are forced to the conclusion that this is an election-time measure, not a war-time measure. Some few weeks ago my hon. friend introduced a Bill for the extension of the term of Parliament for another year. Some hon. gentlemen on this side, as well as some on the other side, did not see eye to eye with the Government on the question of the further extension of Parliament, and because the resolution was not adopted unanimously the Government immediately started to prepare for an election. A Bill was then drafted and brought before the House, known as The Military Voters' Act, the purpose of which was to give to soldiers in Canada and overseas the right to vote. No one one this side of the House objected to the principle of giving to the soldiers who were fighting our battles every opportunity of casting their vote. I am sure that the Minister of Justice (Mr. Doherty) who had charge of the Bill will give at least some gentlemen on this side credit for assisting the passage of that Bill and endeavouring to make it as workable as possible.

A few days ago the hon. gentleman who introduced the measure now under con-

sideration was promoted to the higher position of Secretary of State. Certain newspapers supporting hon. gentlemen opposite expressed the view that his promotion was necessary in order that he might be enabled to look after the elections that were soon to be held. Well, he has started in very well to look after the election. The next Bill introduced was this one respecting the franchise, disfranchising in some cases and enfranchising in others. I shall not take up the time of the House by discussing the disfranchisement of a certain class of the population. That part of the measure has been discussed very fully and very carefully by hon. gentlemen who have more information on the subject than I have. But I wish to refer briefly to the proposed enfranchisement of female relatives of soldiers who are at the front. I have never been a strong supporter of woman suffrage. I have never had objection to extending the franchise to the women of any province if I was convinced that the women in that province actually desired the franchise. I had some experience in the local legislature of my native province, and up to the time that I left that assembly and came here I had not been convinced that the majority of the women of New Brunswick actually desired the franchise.

I realize that there was a certain number who did. The legislature was waited upon by women from certain sections asking that the franchise be extended to the women, but I never felt convinced that the majority of the women desired that franchise, because in New Brunswick—and I presume the same is true of a number of other provinces—the women have a limited franchise in regard to municipal and civil elections, and very few of them, in those elections go to the polls and exercise that privilege. I do not believe they would show any more interest in casting their votes for provincial or Dominion representatives. But, so far as I am concerned, as soon as the women of the country desire that franchise, I am prepared to give my assent to any franchise that may be extended to them. I realize as fully as any other man in the Dominion can realize the very great responsibility and burden that has been assumed by the women of Canada during the progress of this war, and I want to say, on behalf of those women who are not being given the privilege of the franchise under this Bill, that not only are they just as entitled to it as those who are receiving it under this measure, but it would be in the interest of the women of Canada if the whole female population were given that privilege instead of only those who are related to the soldiers at the front. If you go into the rooms of such associations as the Daughters of the Empire, the Red Cross or the Council of Women, you will find women working together, women who have worked together for three years in the interest of the soldiers at the front, and who are doing all they can in every way to give assistance and sustenance to our boys, and it does not seem right, just, equitable, fair or in the interest of British fair play, to say: We are going to give the vote to ten or twenty of those women out of one of those societies, who have been sitting around the table day in and day out—and almost, I believe, on the Sabbath, working for our soldiers,—and we are going to refuse to allow fifty others of those women to vote. Not only is that unfair, but it will have this effect. Instead of those women being drawn closer and closer together in the interest of the work in which they are so heartily and so sincerely engaged, a certain amount of dissatisfaction will be created amongst them, and the women who are not given the franchise will feel that they are not being accorded fair treatment by this Parliament in that regard.

I understand that, in some of the western provinces, if not in all of them, a list is made up by the enumerators as is provided for by this Bill. Therefore, they will not be subject to the same inconvenience that will arise in my province in which we have not that form of making up our lists. In New Brunswick we have always voted on the provincial lists. It was a very simple procedure, and a great deal of dissatisfaction will arise amongst the people of the different provinces who are not accustomed to these enumerators and this method of making up the lists. Very great care must be taken to ensure that a fair list is made up and an opportunity afforded to every person entitled to be placed upon that list to go before an enumerator, whoever he may be or wherever he may hold his court of revision, and that no unfair advantage is taken by any person for or on behalf of any particular candidate. The question of the franchise is a serious one in this country, one in which the people are very deeply interested, and one that cannot be passed over lightly or dealt with in a trifling way. It is a serious matter to interfere with that right of the citizens of this country, a right which they have enjoyed for so many years, a right which they will naturally

look forward to enjoy. Those of us who have had the misfortune to run many elections realize the dissatisfaction that is aroused in the mind of a voter when he comes to the poll and finds his name inadvertently left off the list. He would sooner lose $100 than find when he comes to the poll that he has through inadvertence been disfranchised, and he will make more commotion, and more feeling will be aroused, over that one little thing than over other things far more important.

The Secretary of State told the House and the country this afternoon that they were disfranchising a certain portion of the population of this country because he and the Government believed that those people would vote against the Government when it appealed to the country. He told us, on the other hand, he was enfranchising a certain other portion of the population composed of three or four hundred thousand women relatives of soldiers who had gone to the front, because he believed they would vote for the Government. So far as the rights of the citizens are concerned, it does not seem to me to be of very much importance whether they are to vote for the Government or against the Government. Personally I am not afraid to take my chance; I am willing to take a gambler's chance and trust my election or my defeat to the women who will be added to the list of the constituency of Westmorland. If we are to judge by the scores, the hundreds of letters that have come to me and to other members of the different constituencies through out this Dominion, from the mothers, wives and sisters of the soldiers who have gone to the front, who have had to wait month after month, and some of them over a year without receiving the fair treatment they deserve to receive and should receive at the hands of this Government which is responsible for the machinery for carrying on the different operations in connection with this war, the Secretary of State need not compliment himself too warmly or congratulate the Government too fervently in regard to the result of the votes of the women whom he has enfranchised throughout Canada on account of their being relatives of soldiers at the front.

In conclusion, I do hope and trust that the Secretary of State, who fathers this Bill, will see his way clear to extend the franchise not only to the female relatives of soldiers who have gone to the front, but to all women in the Dominion over twenty-one years of age who are British subjects. The women of this country are working

[Mr. Copp.]

nobly and well for the Red
11 p.m. Cross, the Patriotic Fund, and other organizations for the comfort of the soldier, irrespective of whether they had husband, son, or brother at the front, because they realize that every man who has gone to the front and is fighting for King and country is just as much related to them in a national way as if he was their own brother, or husband, or son. I sincerely trust that the Government will reconsider that provision of the Bill and extend the franchise to all women of the Dominion within the limits I have mentioned, who amply deserve this consideration.

Mr. MARTIN (Saint-Mary's, Montreal) (Translation): Mr. Speaker, you don't need to keep your watch at hand, for I shall certainly not take up the whole twenty minutes allotted to me to discuss the important question now before this House.

When a certain delegation of ladies of this country came to see the Prime Minister during this session and asked him to extend the franchise to the women of this country, they were not claiming that privilege for a certain class of women only, but really for all women in general. I am disappointed not to see here to-night the hon. member for Montreal St. Antoine (Sir Herbert Ames) in order to take their part and see to it that the franchise be conferred not only on the women of Montreal, but on all the women of Canada; that hon. member, who is the president of the Patriotic Fund, as well as president of the Red Cross Fund, has made a most particular appeal to the women of Canada and, thanks to their efforts, they have succeeded in having millions and millions subscribed to help the Allies, generally, and more especially the Canadians who have enlisted to defend the British flag and the cause of Liberty. The hon. member for St. Antoine exercises some influence over the Government, and were he here to-night, he would certainly do something to have justice given to the women of Canada. If there is a man who knows the many sacrifices of every kind made by the Canadian women, it actually is the hon. member for St. Antoine, who has had the honour of being elected president of the Canadian Patriotic Fund for the whole of Canada. In the pursuit of that patriotic work, he appealed to the women of Canada in general, and the ladies of the upper classes readily worked hand in hand with the workingmen's wives in order to insure in every way the success of this Patriotic Fund.

Mr. Speaker, personally I am not sympathetic to the proposal of granting the franchise to the women of this country, but if the franchise is to be in any way conferred on some of them, it seems to me that it should be given to all and that this is only a question of justice. For my part, I must state that many letters have reached me asking that I demand the Government to grant the franchise to all the women of this country, if they should think of granting it only to a certain class of them.

The measure which the Government are submitting to us to-day has certainly not for its object to win the war, but rather to win the elections which will soon come off. If such is the Governement's pretension, I say that they are greatly mistaken and that we, of the Opposition, have no reason to fear the effects of that measure, for these will be quite the opposite of the result expected by the Government. Do you believe for instance, that the mother of a family, who has lost her son, her only support, and to whom the Government have not given justice as far as the pension is concerned, do you believe such a woman will vote in favour of this same Government? Do you believe that sisters who have lost their brother in the war and who have received no aid from the Government, do you think they will vote for this same Government? No, Mr. Speaker, I believe this measure will in no way change the people's decision, because the present Government have not taken the necessary measures to assist the families left behind by those of our Canadians who have enlisted to go and defend the British flag. No, I repeat, we need have no fear as to this measure; it will be in our favour. During sometime, these gentlemen opposite believed, or at least, seemed to believe that the women's vote, in general, would be cast in their favour. But they soon changed their minds upon that subject, and they thought that such a measure would perhaps tend to annul the votes registered by the mothers and sisters of those enlisted.

Upon that point, Mr. Speaker, I can speak knowingly, for many mothers and sisters, who have lost in this war their only support, did come to my office, as Mayor of Montreal, and complained—that the Government was not giving them any means of subsistence. I say that this measure is an injustice, for if those who have given to the colours those who were their supports deserve that privilege, why should it not be the same with these young men and girls, employed in our manufactories, who have sacrificed two, three and even four days' wages, every year, in order to contribute their share to the Patiotic Fund? What reason can be advanced to leave them aside, when has come the hour of what I would call the reward? We have moreover in Montreal—and it is the same elsewhere, I presume—all kinds of institutions which have been engaged, for three years past, in patriotic works having for object the levying of funds to assist the soldiers families. The ladies of Montreal, in particular, have worked night and day to organize tag days, and euchres, others have given a good deal of their time to sewing rooms, all of them also in order to help our soldiers. And when the day comes to recognize these self-imposed sacrifices, these ladies are all left aside.

My hon. friend from the St. Lawrence division (Mr. Bickerdike) has just mentioned, a few moments ago, the fact that the President of the United States was in favour of granting the franchise to all the women of the American republic. Would it not be simple justice to do the same in Canada?

Well, Mr. Speaker, this is another injustice committed by this Government and injustice will fall back upon them, upon you also, since you are with them, because you are trying to take means—which I might qualify as dishonest, if the word is parliamentary—to extend the franchise to a certain category of women, because you imagine that by such a manœuvre you will be able to carry the elections.

We know perfectly well that this is done, only to allow the Government to get another lease of power. You believe that, by such means, you will be able to carry the elections, but you are deceiving yourselves, this will be against you; the soldiers back from the front will vote against the Government, and those who are still overseas, in the trenches, will also cast their votes against the Government. Indeed, when we have an opportunity to discuss with some of the returned soldiers, we learn their way of thinking about the present Government. I have had the occasion, as mayor of Montreal, to receive several of them and I know what I can believe on that point. You will see, I tell you, that these returned soldiers will record their vote against the Government.

You did not want to submit to the people the Conscription question, because you knew that measure was most unpopular, the people are anxious to govern themselves. Now, Mr. Speaker, you come to-day with a

measure still—if the term is parliamentary—more dishonest, because it does not give every one equal justice. If you grant the right to vote to a certain class of women, you should grant it to all, without any discrimination.

As to the question of disfranchising certain people who are British citizens, because they were naturalized within the past fifteen years, believe me, these people, from the first to the last, will surely work against the Government, because you deny them their rights; there again you are committing an injustice as you have always been doing since 1911, all your measures have been autocratic. You have, in almost every measure you have submitted to Parliament, stripped the people of their rights, and you are now again trying to take them away from a certain class of citizens for the purpose of securing power for yourselves.

In fact, you don't know what means to resort to in order to get a new lease of power; you are trying to remain in office, in spite of the people, but you will see, when the elections are held, that if you are not turned out of office, it will probably be due to the fact that you will have taken means most dishonest—if the term is parliamentary—as you have always done.

Mr. Speaker, I have the honour to speak in the name of the metropolis of Canada. As I have stated a few moments ago, I am not sympathetic to the proposal of granting the franchise to the women of this country, but I assert that if the Government want, by this measure, to confer the right of the franchise to a certain class of women, they should give it to everyone of them. This goes to show that you are taking every possible means to cling to the power you have unfairly obtained in 1911, by deceiving the electorate of the province of Quebec.

The women, as the speaker who preceded me stated a few minutes ago, do not vote. That is true. Indeed, we encounter all kinds of trouble, especially in a municipal contest wherein they are directly interested on account of their personal property qualifications, we have, I say, enormous difficulties to convince them that they should vote. We resort to every possible means to bring them to the polls, but they do not want to come. I repeat it, Mr. Speaker, by giving the right to vote to a certain class of women only, an injustice is committed. If, at least, the franchise were extended to all the women, many of them might probably consider it their duty to go and vote. As far as we are concerned, we of the Opposition, we have no reason to fear an unfavorable verdict, I am convinced of that. As I said at the beginning, I shall not take up my entire twenty minutes, because other speakers are to follow me; but I had a duty to discharge. A delegation from the Ladies Business Association of Montreal came to see me in my office and ask me, if the measure were introduced in Parliament, to insist upon the Government that the franchise be granted to all the women and not only to a certain portion of them. Those ladies, Mr. Speaker, have done no more no less than has done the delegation which came to see the Prime Minister and asked him to extend the franchise to all the women in Canada. These ladies did not come here to ask the franchise for a certain portion of them, but they did demand it for every woman of the country. The present Government, as I have just stated, are only trying, through this Bill now before the House, to win the elections and not to win the war.

On the conscription question, it was the very same thing; the Government have done all they could to prevent the people's voice from being heard, but let them remember, Mr. Speaker, that the people exist before the Governments, and that, if there are governments existing, they have been created by the popular will. Do not, therefore, try to shove the people aside.

It is evident that the measure now submitted has no other object than to secure a majority, made up of certain category which is believed to be in favour of the Government, but the Government are making an egregious mistake. Time will tell when we have the advantage of going before the people. You are trying, by every possible or imaginable means, to put back the date of the elections, the result of which scares you; but I can, without any fear, assert that you will be driven out of power, because never have the people seen a Government—I will not say rotten, for that expression is forbidden, it is unparliamentary—but never has the country seen a Government so audacious as the one we now have. You know that so well that you dare not face public opinion, and of that fact we have the proof in all the bold measures which you submit to this Parliament.

Mr. R. B. BENNETT (Calgary): Mr. Speaker, my hon. friends on the other side have fallen into a fundamental error in their discussion of this Bill. There is no pledge, and there were no guarantees, and there is no deprivation of citizenship. In all the arguments which have been addressed to the House this evening, refer-

ence has been made to "citizenship" but "citizenship" and "franchise" are not interchangeable terms. That is the fundamental error which is the basis of all the arguments that have been addressed to this House to-night. Franchise is not inherent to citizenship. It never was, and I suppose never will be. Franchise is granted by a legislative body. It is a privilege conferred by legislation upon a class in a community which is named by that legislation. The hon. gentleman who has just taken his seat (Mr. Martin) must know that the province from which he comes, under the regime of Hon. Mr. Mercier, enacted that civil servants who were in the employ of the Federal Government should not have a vote in that province. They deprived their fellow-citizens of a vote; they deprived them of what my hon. friends on the other side have to-night called "citizenship" but which was not in fact citizenship, but merely the privilege of the franchise. The same thing was done in Nova Scotia. We must start with the fundamentals, and the fundamental that we must get in our minds is that citizenship and franchise are two different things, that the one does not involve the other, and that the power which confers citizenship does not necessarily confer franchise by so doing. If we get that fundamental fact clearly before us, we will relieve ourselves of much trouble, and relieve this debate of much acrimony. It is not my word I ask you, Mr. Speaker, or this House to take for that fact, but I ask you to take the considered judgment of the Lords of the Privy Council. When the question was considered by the Privy Council in the case of Cunningham vs. Tomy Houma in 1903, the Earl of Halsbury who delivered the judgment, said:

> In this case a naturalized Japanese claimed to be placed upon the register of voters for the electoral district of Vancouver city, and the objection which is made to his claim is that by the election law of the province, it is enacted that no Japanese, whether naturalized or not, shall have his name placed on the register of voters, or shall be entitled to vote. . . . A child of Japanese parentage, born in Vancouver city, is a natural-born subject of the King, and would be equally excluded from the possession of the franchise. The extent to which naturalization will confer privileges has varied both in this country and elsewhere. From the time of William III down to Victoria, no naturalization was permitted which did not exclude the alien naturalized from sitting in Parliament or in the Privy Council. . . . In the history of this country, the right to the franchise has been granted and withheld on a great number of grounds, conspicuously upon grounds of religious faith, yet no one has ever suggested that a person excluded from the franchise was not under allegiance to the Sovereign. . . . The right of protection and the obligations of allegiance are necessarily involved in the nationality conferred by naturalization, but the privileges attached to it, where these depend upon residence, are quite independent of it.

That is the whole story in a few words. Lord Halsbury said that the right of protection and the obligations of allegiance are necessarily involved in the nationality conferred by naturalization, but the privileges attached to it, where these depend upon residence, are quite independent of it. And upaon this, it is competent for this Parliament, by virtue of the powers inherent in it, to determine who shall be placed upon its register of voters. It may determine that civil servants shall not be so placed. It may determine that Germans shall not be so placed. It may determine that Austrians shall not be so placed, or that any other class of individuals may not be placed on that register, and in so doing Parliament is exercising its great law-enacting power of determining what class of citizens shall exercise the franchise for the election of members to this Parliament. That is the first fundamental principle, and if my hon. friends will disassociate franchise from citizenship and citizenship from franchise, and adopt the language of the Earl of Halsbury, they will find little difficulty in understanding the great principles underlying this legislation.

Why should this Parliament exercise the powers I have referred to? The principle upon which this House must always act is that on matters involving the national existence of this House, of this country, of this Dominion, only those who are nationals should be permitted to vote, by every rule of law and reason. Every instinct of sympathy, and commonsense, and sentiment must indicate that only those who are nationals should vote upon national issues. Upon the great issues of the life or death of the State, upon its destiny, upon the supremacy of our arms, and the life of our institutions, only those men who are nationals should exercise the national franchise. On provincial and municipal matters, the provincial legislatures may determine that any man can vote, because no national issue is concerned, but when the great national issue of the life or death and the integrity of our Empire and the life of the State is concerned, then only men who are nationals should vote.

Now, who are nationals? Nationals are, first, British subjects by birth; secondly,

British subjects by naturalization—yes, provided that that naturalization confers upon them the status of British subjects throughout the world. Our Naturalization Act and the very statutes read here this evening confer upon the Austrians and the Germans in Western Canada the status of British subjects only within Canada. They were not British subjects throughout the world. They were not British subjects in the United States. They are only British subjects in so far as Canada is concerned. We have just passed and placed upon the statute books of this country a Military Service Act, by which we have provided that we will take men compulsorily for the service of the State, and in so taking them the statute means taking them for the first line of Canadian defence in the trenches of France and Flanders. Across the Atlantic, out of Canada beyond the three-mile limit, these naturalized persons cease to be British subjects. They are not British subjects on the shores of France and Flanders. Therefore, at that moment, when they pass beyond the three-mile limit, that dormant alien nationality will revive, and they will again become Germans and Austrians. They are no longer Britons. Ceasing to be Britons, if they were taken prisoners in the front-line trenches, they would be shot as traitors, because they owed military allegiance to Germany and Austria. These men are disfranchised, therefore, by the law of their own country with respect to this great war. Our law has declared whom we will take compulsorily to fight our battles overseas. The only men who can be taken—and we provide that when taken they are for that very reason given the franchise—are our nationals. The minute these men of alien birth pass beyond the three-mile limit their nationality revives, and once more they are citizens of their own state. But my hon. friends ask why they are not drafted into the armies overseas. I will tell you why. Because, under international law, no alien can be made to fight for the state in which he lives. Under international law Britain cannot take an Austrian or a German out of Canada, land him in France, and compel him to fight her battles. These men are aliens when they have passed beyond the three-mile limit, they are no longer Canadians, no longer British citizens, and under the canons of international law we cannot take them to fight our battles there. That is the reason why, under the Army Act of 1881, aliens are not permitted to fight in the forces of England except, I think, one in fifty. These men cannot fight, therefore, and so long as they remain in Canada they cannot be drafted by Germany or Austria; but once they pass out of that limit, then, under the treaty powers, under our very Act of Naturalization, and under the Act of the Imperial Parliament of 1870, which we copied, these men are no longer citizens of this State; they are Austrians and Germans; and as such they cannot exercise their franchise in this country. That is the story, and that is the reason why the great principle is being applied here that only nationals shall vote on national questions. And, nationals being only those men who are British by birth or naturalization—using the word "British" in the broad sense in which it is used in the new Naturalization Act which will be the enactment common to all the British Empire—these men are not British subjects. As the great issue in this war is not only the life of this Dominion, but the life of the great Empire which we call the British Empire, and as nationals only must vote for the life or death of the Empire, it follows that these men, not being nationals, not being British subjects beyond the boundaries of Canada, may not, in Canada, exercise their franchise.

We have not rested at that, we have gone further. We have said that in this case where there is an obligation for military service, these men shall not be liable for that obligation unless they exercise the privilege of the franchise. On the one hand we deprive them of the franchise; on the other hand we release them from the obligation—the release from the obligation here, the deprivation of the franchise there; the release from obligation is part and parcel of international law. For this compulsory service they are required beyond the boundaries of Canada, and their latent nationality reviving they become aliens—Germans, Austrians—and as such they are deprived of the franchise because they cannot meet the obligation, not being British subjects in the broad and true sense in which that word is used. It is said that this is a political right and that under the certificate of naturalization they are entitled to all the political privileges that we are entitled to. That is true, and one of the political privileges that attaches to every man, if he be French Canadian, English, Irish or Scotch, it matters not, is that he may or may not have his name placed upon the register of voters. The same power in the legislature of Quebec

that deprived the officials of the federal Government of the vote in Quebec, that gave them a lesser status of citizenship, that deprived them in Nova Scotia of the vote under Mr. Fielding—that same power exercised in the federal domain is part and parcel of the political life of the country, and all that is meant, by the acceptance of political rights, privileges and powers under the Naturalization Act is that they accept what Parliament gives them in common with everyone else—nothing more or less. Any one who studies the statutes and studies history will find that that is the case. But there is another reason that it seems to me would be sufficient, if all other reasons failed, and that is that we in this country are at war and those who know, great historians and philosophers, have told us that the tie of blood is the strongest of all. A great historian, some of whose writings I read the other day, said:

> I put the motives of men thus, in order of their strength:
> (1) Blood, that is race or nationality. (2) Patriotism or love of land and country. (3) Interest or the means by which man lives in trade and commerce. (4) Religion, which is the life and refectory of his soul but as a motive uncertain and incalculable in its influence, and (5) Politics, including all constitutional questions which are merely the means or instruments for attaining these ends.

So that blood ranks first in the motives influencing the minds of man. And I say to the hon. member for Strathcona (Mr. Douglas), notwithstanding what he has said, that there are hundreds of men who have left my province of Alberta, reservists for the Austrian and German armies, and hundreds remain there to-day who would go if they could—only the strong arm of the law prevents them from leaving for that purpose. To say that these men who would, if they could, use their rifles against our fellow Canadians shall have the right to vote against the man, one of the thirty thousand who died, is contrary to every principle of—

Some hon. MEMBERS: Hear, hear.

Mr. R. B. BENNETT: I say more that these men would be the first to say that is so. I have talked with some of them; I know something of their views, something of the opinions of these intelligent German reservists who have come to this country to make a home, and they tell me that the tie of blood is strong upon them, the call of the Fatherland, the call of the homeland, the call of brothers and fathers and cousins fighting in the German and Austrian armies. I talked to one the other day whose uncle was an Austrian general. This man told me that the tie of blood is strong upon them; that they will keep quiet, that they will do nothing wrong, but will try and behave themselves—but the call, the insistent call of the blood is ever upon them. And these men should never be permitted to say whether or not our soldiers in the trenches are to be reinforced by their fellow-Canadians. Such a condition must not, cannot be permitted to exist. Indeed, I believe that the great cry that will go up from the men and women of this country will be that this measure does not proceed far enough, that it will still permit some who are called by the call of the blood, the tie of kinship from overseas, to vote in this great election as the ties of kinship guide them and not as the call of patriotism to Canada should influence them. That is the story, and that is all there is to be said about it.

I heard the hon. member for Strathcona assail the word, the pledged word, of a sergeant-major who had gone from Calgary, a gentleman who went to the front and has returned wounded and retired from service. It ill becomes a man who all last summer wore the uniform of the Canadian Army Service Corps and drew the pay of his rank, to reflect upon that man who offered his life for this country. It is time that sort of thing was stopped, that that sort of arrant hypocrisy was no longer heard. I say by all the reasons that influence men's minds, by the influences that have swayed men in days gone by according to all the great lawgivers from the time of Moses even until to-day, those only who are nationals should decide our national existence and our national life or death. I know the men of whom I speak, and I do not blame them; I enter into their spirit; I think I know something of what they feel and how strong the call of their fellows is upon them, and that call, strong as it is, should be the call that deprives these aliens of the franchise in this country.

So far as the enfranchisement of women is concerned, there is no man who will not say that the women of this country, by giving their husbands and fathers and sons in this great war, have earned the right to poll their vote on this great issue. No man will deny it. When you think of the long delays, the weary nights, the great anxiety, the tears, the strain that they have gone through while their loved ones have been at the front, who will deny them the right

to vote. And who, at the same time, will say that a broad and general provision of women's franchise should be enacted when a conflict of citizenship is upon us, when jarring and disturbing elements of nationality are on us, when fine distinctions that must be adjusted alike by the Imperial Parliament and parliaments overseas yet are unsettled—when all these vast problems are upon us, who would say that a general measure of enfranchisement of women should be given? Only those who desire to make a little political capital against their opponents.

But what of Canadian men and women, men who love their country more than their party, and women who place higher value upon the great sacredness of the ballot than upon the mere way of exercising it? They know, feel and believe that in a time like this there must be a dividing line somewhere and that dividing line has been found on the ground of personal sacrifice, thereby indicating that those who have given this service and made this sacrifice shall be those who exercise their franchise at this time. Let us not deceive ourselves. We are in the midst of the greatest of all conflicts. We struggle against spies in our own land. Spies have been discovered out in the western country. They have been found in western battalions, and have met their death as such in the early morn. There were reservists in the streets of Calgary a few weeks before the war broke out. They disappeared and are now prisoners of war with us. We are told of a German from Lethbridge being taken prisoner in battle. Hundreds of men of that character were there. These men left our land after having lived amongst us and exercised their privileges as fellow citizens and are now shooting at our brothers and relatives at the front. No member in this House should say that those men should have a vote, and men who would do the same thing under similar circumstances, are not to be given the franchise. I will close what I have to say in the words of that great apostle, to whom my hon. friend from North Cape Breton (Mr. McKenzie) referred—"For we wrestle not against flesh and blood, but against principalities, against powers, against the rulers of darkness of this world, against spiritual wickedness in high places."

Hon. CHARLES MURPHY (Russell): How desperate the position of the Government is—

Some Hon. MEMBERS: Oh, oh!

[Mr. R. B. Bennett.]

Mr. MURPHY: How desperate the position of the Government is has not only been made plain by "the loud laugh that speaks the vacant mind," on the part of hon. gentlemen opposite who have just indulged in such unbecoming laughter, but also by the fact that the Government for its defence has had to go outside its party ranks and call in, as its champion to defend this measure, an independent member who sits on that side of the House. A little later in my observations I will refer to one or two things my hon. and eloquent friend has said.

Synchronizing—as the Minister of Finance would say—with the application by the Government of closure to the second reading of this Bill, was the presence on the floor of this House this afternoon of Lord Northcliffe, the gentleman who led the intrigue that broke up the Liberal party in England, that deposed Mr. Asquith from the premiership of Great Britain, and placed Mr. Lloyd George at the head of a small but select and powerful autocracy that sits outside Parliament, and which, as time goes on, deprives Parliament more and more of its hard-won rights and privileges. Every student of recent political history will recognize the appropriateness of Lord Northcliffe's first visit to the Canadian Parliament coinciding with the occasion upon which the Government of the day resorted to the drastic measure of closure to force the second reading of the alleged Franchise Bill which is designed not to elicit an expression of the people's will but is deliberately designed to thwart the expression of the people's will. If the time at my disposal were not limited to 20 minutes, I might be tempted to indulge in a few observations as to the near or remote connection of Lord Northcliffe with certain recent political happenings in Canada, more particularly in the newspaper line. That, however much as I regret it, is an indulgence that I must postpone until another occasion.

Whether regard be had to the provisions of the Bill itself, or to the manner in which it has been introduced and forced upon the House, it is safe to say that the thought uppermost in the minds of the people of this country who are watching the despotic course of the Government is the one expressed in the old adage, "Whom the gods would destroy, they first make mad."

On Thursday of last week, my hon. friend the Secretary of State (Mr. Meighen), in explaining this Bill, said that war service would be the basis of war franchise. In the very next breath he made it clear

that war service is not to be the basis of this war franchise, because the Bill, while giving votes to the wives, widows, mothers, daughters and sisters of the soldiers overseas, denies the vote to the thousands of Canadian women who do not happen to have relatives overseas, but who have rendered magnificent war service at home, in making munitions, in providing comforts and food for the soldiers, in Red Cross work, in Belgian relief work, and in the innumerable activities of the Daughters of the Empire, and of the Women's Canadian Clubs. All these women are to be denied the right to vote by this Government's Bill, although in five of the provinces they have such right under the Provincial Franchise Act, which this Bill adopts, but only after it strikes off the names of those women who otherwise would have their franchise preserved. This point cannot be made too clear. For the purpose of emphasizing it, let me refer to a question and answer reported in the proceedings of this House of September 6th, 1917, at page 5729 of Hansard.

Sir Wilfrid Laurier: Am I right in this: that while the women of Ontario and the western provinces have to-day, under the laws of those provinces, the right to vote, they will, with the exception of those who are qualified as the relatives of men who have enlisted, not have the right to vote in this election?

Mr. Meighen: That is correct.

In view of this statement, in justice to the thousands of Canadian women who have rendered war service of incalculable value, how hollow is the pretense of my hon. friend the Secretary of State when he said that this Bill was an attempt on the part of the Government to repair an injustice. This Bill repairs no injustice; it does actual injustice to thousands of loyal, law-abiding Canadians, of whom the women I have mentioned are only one class.

Let us consider another class for a few minutes. It has been stated over and over again in this country, and by none more loudly than by hon. gentlemen opposite and their supporters through the country, that Canada's participation in this war is against the Kaiser and kaiserism, and not against the German people.

But, Sir, this Bill is directed not against the Kaiser and kaiserism, but against the German people themselves, who are resident within the boundaries of Canada. Once this game of disfranchising the foreigner whom we bring to our shores and to whom we guaranteed equal citizenship and equal rights with ourselves is begun, where, I ask you, is it likely to stop? A moment's reflection will show how vicious is the step which the Government is taking in this Bill. As you are quite well aware, the Allies of to-day may be the enemies of to-morrow; all history proves that. To-day we propose in this Bill to disfranchise the Germans, Austrians, Hungarians and Bulgarians in Canada because they are of enemy country origin. If in the next war Belgium, Russia, Italy, Sweden, Norway and the United States are opposed to Great Britain, then to be consistent we will, in the case of a war-time election, have to disfranchise all the Belgians, Russians, Italians, Swedes, Norwegians and Americans within our borders. It is quite obvious, therefore, that by introducing this measure the Government has at one stroke succeeded in embittering our foreign-born citizens whom we now propose to disfranchise, and in implanting suspicion and distrust in the minds of those other citizens whose turn may come next.

The member for Calgary (Mr. R. B. Bennett), in his eloquent address of a few minutes ago, said that in the discussion of this question it was absolutely necessary to keep separate the questions of franchise and citizenship. I accede to that suggestion, but I want to point out that that does not extricate the Government from the difficulty into which it has got itself by introducing this Bill. Neither, I submit, does my hon. friend's reference to the disfranchising of certain civil servants in the province of Quebec by the provincial Government help this Government one iota in connection with this measure. That has nothing to do, for instance, with the case of the Mennonites, who are affected by the Bill before the House. In 1873 or 1874 we entered into a solemn treaty with those people. We brought them to Canada under the express provision, in what they rightly claim to be their bill of rights, that they were to have the use of their language and to be exempt from military service. In the original Bill of rights they were guaranteed the other right of citizenship, that of the franchise, when they should become naturalized. In the Bill before us we tell these people that if they exercise the franchise they are not exempt from military service, and to that extent we break faith with those whom we brought to Canada under the solemn compact entered into in 1873 or 1874. My hon. friend's argument in reference to citizenship and to franchise, so far as he proposes to apply it to certain residents of the western provinces, is refuted by the fact that the 218th Battalion, which was raised

and sent to the front from my hon. friend's province, was, I am told, composed in large part of Austrians whose services this Government was glad to accept.

On Saturday last two notable speeches were delivered in this discussion, one by the member for Edmonton (Mr. Oliver) and the other by the member for Saskatoon (Mr. McCraney). They told how this Bill would affect certain groups of citizens in the western provinces from which they come; their speeches were most interesting and most illuminating.

Let me illustrate for a few minutes how this Bill affects another group of citizens who reside here in Ottawa. I am informed that there are about 1,500 Germans in this city and that several families among them settled here nearly fifty years ago. In times past many of these men joined local regiments here, notably the Governor General's Foot Guards, the 43rd Regiment, and the Ottawa Field Battery. It appears that these Germans were told that the oath of allegiance which they took on joining these units gave them the right of citizenship. In any event, they exercised these rights for years without question or hindrance. In more recent years, however, these men discovered that they had been misled, and the majority, I am told, have been naturalized within the last fifteen years. These men, with the exception of those who have sons, grandsons or brothers overseas fighting in the ranks of the Allies, will be disfranchised by the measure which is now before the House. Naturally, that will raise feelings of deep resentment in the breasts of these men, all the deeper in view of their conduct since the beginning of the war. In the first year of the war an agitation based on ignorance was started against these people in Ottawa. It was about the time of the sinking of the Lusitania, and some of the agitation centered around that tragic event. But these Germans, while law-abiding people, are not inclined to lie down under an injury. They held a public meeting under the auspices of the St. Paul's German Lutheran church in this city, and they passed a resolution which I shall take the liberty of reading to the House. As published in the papers of May 18, 1915, that resolution was as follows:

Whereas members of this congregation have been resident in Ottawa and vicinity for nearly half a century and it is now more than forty-one years since they built their first church for divine worship at the corner of King Edward avenue and Wilbrod street in this city;

And whereas during the whole period of their residence in this city the members of this congregation have lived on terms of amity and good will with their fellow-citizens and are sincerely desirous that these amicable relations should continue to exist;

And whereas certain false statements designed to prejudice the members of this congregation in the eyes of their fellow-citizens have lately been published with reference to certain events of the present deplorable war, and it is deemed advisable to refute these statements by unanimous and official action on the part of the congregation;

Now, therefore, be it resolved as follows:

That as Canadians and British subjects by birth or naturalization, we recognize and profess no other loyalty than that which we cheerfully render to Canada and the British Empire;

That as citizens we claim the right to share at all times in the trials and sacrifices of this Dominion, and, having regard to our numbers and financial means, we have willingly assumed our share of the burden which such a right imposes in the present struggle against the demon of militarism;

That we condemn as a deliberate and inhuman crime the sinking of the Lusitania and the employment by the Germans of other methods of warfare which are equally unjustifiable;

That we deplore the great loss of life entailed by the employment of such un-Christian methods, and we pledge ourselves anew to further assist Canada and the Empire in the task of destroying the military autocracy which has so long menaced the peace of the world;

And be it further resolved that copies of these resolutions be sent to His Worship Mayor N. D. Porter and to the city newspapers.

Signed by the vestry on behalf of the congregation,

Aug. Garske,
Fred. Kritsch,
Robt. A. W. Hupp.

Ottawa, May 17, 1915.

That is not all. My further information is that approximately fifty of these men enlisted and went overseas; that four have been killed in action; that two have died of wounds; that several others have enlisted and were later discharged as medically unfit. I am told also that no class of our citizens have contributed more frequently and more generously to patriotic and charitable objects connected with the war than this same group of German Canadians. It is natural that the men of this group who are to be disfranchised should be incensed against the Government. They ask: If our vote is to be taken away, if we are to be denied a voice in saying how and by whom Canada's participation in this war shall be conducted, then will the Government, after the war is over, also exempt us from taxation levied on account of the war? That is a question this Government will have to answer, and that is only one of the many different questions they will

have to answer because of the introduction of the measure now before the House.

If this Bill is unjust in many respects, it is ludicrous in some others. Let me cite one of the latter kind. Section 3 of the Bill provides that:

> Any deputy returning officer, either of his own motion or at the request of any agent or scrutineer, after carefully explaining the meaning of paragraphs (g) and (h) of section 67 of this Act—

By way of parenthesis, I may say that I have seldom heard of a deputy returning officer who was competent to explain the provisions of a statute, and they will be less likely to be able to do it at this election because they will be appointed by hon. gentlemen opposite.

> —may put to any person claiming to vote at an election the following questions:
>
> "Are you a naturalized British subject who was born in an enemy country within the meaning of paragraph (g) of section 67 of the Dominion Elections Act; or who was born in Europe and whose natural language or mother tongue is a language of an enemy country, and, if you are either, when and where were you naturalized?"

Imagine the condition of the poor alien voter when such a question is fired at him. Subsection 2 says:

> If such person refuses to answer fully such questions, or by his manner shows that he was born in an enemy country—

Could folly further go?

Mr. PUGSLEY: His manner?

Mr. MURPHY: Yes, the deputy returning officer is constituted a judge of manner. If the unfortunate voter should, for instance, have been so unlucky as to have eaten for breakfast something that did not agree with him and his countenance gave outward indication of inward pain, the deputy returning officer would be justified in saying that he was born in an enemy country and was, therefore, not entitled to vote. The possibilities under that section of the Bill are enormous. That provision of the Bill would do justice to the genius of a Barnaby Rudge.

As a last word, Mr. Speaker, as I have heard the tap of your gavel, I would like to emphasize the warning given to the Government by my hon. friend from Edmonton, the hon. member for Saskatoon and other hon. gentlemen representing western constituencies. The feelings of resentment aroused by such a Bill as this will not, as those hon. gentlemen have said, subside for a generation. A German chancellor once said that a certain treaty was but a "scrap of paper." By this Bill this Government proposes, in effect, to adopt that dictum as a basis for its legislation and to declare that all the treaties made by Canada with those citizens whom this Bill disfranchises were merely scraps of paper. To such a proposition no fair-minded Canadian can subscribe, and for that reason above all others, I intend to vote against this Bill.

Mr.. L. A. LAPOINTE (Montreal, St James): Mr. Speaker, I do not intend to take up very much time of the House in expressing my opinion on the Bill now before us for consideration. The more this War-time Elections Act is studied, the more it seems to me—and it is admitted—that it ought to be called "The Voters' Manipulation Act," or "An Act of Expediency to Win an Election." For instance, I feel that to be the case when I see the sweeping disfranchisement of a great number of our law-abiding citizens. That will occur in the city of Montreal in which there are quite a number of those people who are accustomed to living with us, who pay their taxes and who are good citizens. They, however, will be deprived of their vote by whatever enumerator the Government may choose, at the proper time, to name. This Bill is going to do a great deal of injustice to those people. In Montreal, there are two or three divisions in which those law-abiding citizens consider they are entitled to and ought to have a right to vote. I am speaking specially for Montreal, because it seems to me that the city, of which I have the honour to represent a division, has the right to fair play, because in Montreal there are many of those people who are carrying on business and who are interested in industries of all kinds, and they should be encouraged instead of, as is being done by this Bill, discouraged by being deprived of the right to express their opinion as to who shall represent them. Why cannot the election take place just as well with the old lists, instead of leaving it in the power of one man in a division to select whom he likes, because when he comes on a name in the list that begins with a "K" or has the diphthong "œ" or the ending "vy" and so on, he may say that man must be a stranger, and immediately that man's name will be struck off. Who is going to be the judge of that? The enumerator. One can see the possibilities when one realizes how this gentleman will be appointed, and that, no doubt, he will not be a friend of the Liberal party. The Soli-

12 m.

citor General said in regard to that class which he is going to disfranchise that, on the whole, it was a class of the population that had conducted itself in a satisfactory manner during the war, but immediately after he had given them a good character, he disfranchised them. I do not know what his idea is on that point. He said that it might be found undesirable to enlist them for combatant service. That is not the question before us at the present time. We find that he is wrong in that regard also, because many sons and other relatives of this class of our population are fighting in France for Canada to-day. We have not hesitated to make full use of such men and to accept their services, but it so happens that in various parts of western Canada—and this is the point I wish to make—there are constituencies in which naturalized aliens form the bulk of the population, and these constituencies have always had the natural habit of voting Liberal. The Government knows that, and particularly the Solicitor General. The Borden Government, therefore, hoists the Union Jack and declares that any man who would vote Liberal shall not be allowed to vote at all, if it can be prevented. Their idea is that it would be treason to allow a man who had been naturalized for a less period than fifteen years to say whether he would prefer a Liberal or a Conservative to represent him in Parliament. Fortunately the real issue in the coming election will not be patriotism versus treachery, but we can form an idea how the election will be fought from the way the Government puts forward this extraordinary franchise Bill. Let me give a brief quotation from the Morning Albertan:

> The Franchise Bill is one of the worst pieces of legislation ever brought to the attention of the Canadian Parliament. It is bad in principle, and scandalous in detail. It has no principle in fact, except that of giving an advantage to the party in power. It disregards sacred obligations made by the nation to loyal Canadians.

That is exactly my own idea. This Bill is framed to favour the Government in the West.

As to granting the vote to the mothers and wives and daughters and sisters of soldiers, there is nothing to grumble about. But why not have adult suffrage for all women in this Dominion? Is not the Government, in this Bill, casting a slur upon every woman who may not have a soldier relative? Such a woman is declared by this Bill to be unfit to exercise the franchise? Why is that? What is the reason for singling out a special class of women voters? Is not the Government's action in granting the vote to some women a frank recognition that woman suffrage must come? The Solicitor General the other day said that this provision was intended, "to give added strength to the vote of the soldiers of Canada." Does that mean that the votes of the rest of the women of Canada would not add strength to the vote of the soldiers? Why does the Government discriminate in this way? The rest of the women of Canada are just as ready to help in the cause as those who have soldier relatives at the front, and I do not see why they should be discriminated against. There is no precedent for such an extraordinary provision, which singles out a certain class of women and says that they shall have the right to vote, but no other women. So far as I am concerned, I would advocate the giving of the vote to all women. I am sorry that the Government, having gone this far, did not go all the way.

I am in receipt of a letter from the Quebec Provincial Woman's Christian Temperance Union, as follows:

> May 15, 1917.
>
> L. A. Lapointe, Esq., M.P.,
> Ottawa.
>
> Dear Sir,—On behalf of the Quebec Provincial Woman's Christian Temperance Union, composed of over 2,500 members, I am writing to ask you when the resolution re woman's franchise comes up in the House, that you will vote in its favour.
>
> Our organization since its formation in this province in 1883, has always stood for women having the vote, so that they may help in the success of our country.
>
> Yours sincerely,
> (Sgd.) E. W. McLachlan.

To which I replied as follows:

> May 22, 1917.
>
> Quebec Provincial Women's Christian Temperance Union,
> Québec, P.Q.
>
> Madame,—
>
> I beg to acknowledge receipt of your letter of 15th May inst., and in reply I would assure you that I will give that question all the consideration which it merits, so as to meet you views.
>
> I have the honour to be Madame,
> Yours truly,
> L. A. Lapointe.

The officers of the Quebec Provincial Women's Christian Temperance Union, who are all well known temperance workers, are as follows: Mrs. J. G. Sanderson, Danville, Que., hon. president; Mrs. F. H. Waycott, 31 Drummond street, Montreal, president; Mrs. John Ewing, Melbourne, Que., vice-president; Mrs. S. W. Foster, Knowlton, Que., hon. vice-president; Mrs. R. W. McLachlan, 310 Lansdowne ave.,

Westmount, Que., corresponding secretary; Miss E. H. Loudon, 289 Hingston ave., Montreal, recording secretary; Miss Mary Irene Bazin, Ormstown, Que., treasurer; Mrs. A. F. Leggatt, 141 Drummond street, Montreal, Y. secretary; Mrs. J. Mahon, 409 Burnside place, Montreal, L. T. L. secretary.

I have read this letter with pleasure, Mr. Speaker, because it represents the views of many similar associations in the city of Montreal, some of them French associations. The hon. member for Montreal, St. Mary's (Mr. Martin) has stated that he has received delegations from French-Canadian organizations. I also have received many, to whom I promised that I would give particular attention to their requests. For instance, the Quebec Provincial Woman's Christian Temperance Union has urged me to support votes for women not simply on behalf of the soldiers, but for the women of Canada generally.

I feel I must register my protest. I regret the Government has not seen fit to avail itself of the opportunity of giving the franchise to all the women of the country. I do not think the Government should be jealous that we on this side are in favour of that principle. Let the Government bring it forward and we will not oppose it in any way. I have not heard any hon. gentleman opposite approving of this principle, although at one time the Prime Minister told us woman suffrage was coming. It is coming now, but with discrimination. The franchise is given to one class, but the other class is slurred. The more legislation brought before us, the more audacious the Government seems to become. They are bringing forward all kinds of measures although they know perfectly well that this Administration is in existence only as the result of an agreement entered into between the two parties a year ago. They are prepared to stop at nothing. As I said on a former occasion, they appear to be under the impression that after them will come the deluge.

Mr. EDMOND PROULX (Prescott): I did not intend to take part in this debate, but after hearing some of the speeches and the explanations of this measure, I thought it was my duty to protest in the name of the women of my constituency, as well as in the name of the few aliens there, who will be disfranchised. I was never a very warm advocate of woman suffrage. When the subject came before the House last year, I spoke against the granting of the vote to women. But if we adopt the principle of giving them the vote, I do not think Parliament should stop at giving it to women who are relatives of soldiers and not grant the same privilege to women in the provinces which have already adopted woman suffrage. Earlier in the session the Prime Minister criticised the position taken by my right hon. leader, who wanted woman suffrage to be extended only to the provinces where they had been given the franchise by the provincial legislature. The Prime Minister expressed the opinion that all the women of Canada should have the franchise. Now, however, he has departed from that policy, and wants to restrict the franchise to the relatives of soldiers. I admit that the relatives of soldiers deserve the right to vote, and I am in favour of granting it to them, but as some of my hon. colleagues have already said, there are many women in this country who have done great work for the war, in the way of knitting socks for the soldiers and other patriotic work—we have frequently seen ladies in the galleries of this House, knitting socks for the soldiers while listening to the debates—and do you not think, Sir, that these ladies should have the right to vote? They spend their days and part of their nights, working for the soldiers. Not all the women of this country are blessed with sons who could be sent to the front, but are they not deserving of the consideration of this Parliament, and are they not deserving of the right to vote? Would they not exercise the franchise as intelligently as those who have relatives at the front? This measure is discriminatory. It is not fair. It is not a British measure. The Prime Minister and the Secretary of State have told us that in this measure the Government is adopting the provincial franchise. That statement is not entirely correct, because in five of the provinces the franchise has been given to women by the provincial legislatures, irrespective of whether they have relatives at the front or not, whereas this measure restricts it to women who have relatives at the front. This measure also departs from the provincial franchise in the preparation of the lists. According to our electoral law, we use the provincial lists, which are made by the municipal officers who are impartial and independent of party politics. By this measure the lists made by the municipal officers are to be only partially adopted. The lists will be partly made by enumerators who will be appointed by the Government who will be partisans of the Government and who will have large

discretionary powers. They may refuse to place men on the lists on the pretext that they are aliens, or that their mother tongue may be alien, whereas the main reason for leaving them off is that these enumerators may suspect they will cast their votes for the Liberal candidate.

Mr. NICKLE: They have an appeal, have they not?

Mr. PROULX: There is no appeal. There are appeals in regard to the lists made in cities and county and district towns of over 9,000 population, but in the other municipalities, which are in the majority, there is no appeal. The list made by the enumerator will be final, although, if a man is not on the list, he can go to the polling booth and cast his vote if he is prepared to swear he was omitted from the list and has the right to vote. You know, Mr. Speaker, that persons who are not on the list would not care to go through the ordeal of taking an oath in order to be entitled to cast their votes. In any event, even if they do vote, it does not count until it is established before the judge that they had the right to vote. It is only on a recount that these votes would be counted. Austrians, Germans, and others from enemy countries or whose mother tongue is that of an enemy country may have come here years ago. They came at the invitation of the Government. They have settled in our Northwest, they have cultivated the land and developed the country, they have taken their naturalization papers and have been assured that they will be granted the privileges of British citizenship. These people have not been guilty of any sedition or disloyalty. If they were, certainly this Parliament would have the right, and would have more than the right, the duty, to deprive them of the franchise.

I was surprised to hear the hon. member for South Wellington (Mr. Guthrie) say that the Germans of Ontario, as a rule, were disloyal. I think that my hon. friend has exaggerated the situation. There may be a few who are disloyal. But if he got a frigid reception at one patriotic meeting, that does not say that they are disloyal or guilty of sedition. We say that blood is thicker than water. Their blood is not British blood or French blood; their blood is the blood of people who are at war with France and England. The hon. member cited one particular instance, but we must not judge a whole nationality by one instance.

Besides depriving those people of their franchise, I maintain that this Act is going to create disunion and discord in this country. Even the people who are not deprived of their franchise, because they were naturalized before 1902, will resent the insult which is offered to them by this measure. This is a disrupting measure. May I quote, to substantiate my statement, an article which appeared in the Toronto Globe of last Saturday. The Toronto Globe is not very partial to the Liberal party. For some time it has favoured the Government rather than the Opposition. It has supported the Government very strongly on the Military Service Bill and other measures since the beginning of the session. The Globe says:

A Disruptive Measure.

The War-Time Election Act is a surrender on the part of the Government to the machine element of the party. It strengthens the suspicion that manipulation of the franchise is a punishment for those western Liberals who refused to enter a National Government under the leadership of Sir Robert Borden. It is asserted that when the western men were in Ottawa the Prime Minister told them that any Act of disfranchisement would be personally repugnant to him. But, as in many other instances, he has been too weak to withstand the pressure from certain of his colleagues.

As a practical means of winning a Federal election the Act is futile and clumsy. The last census showed that the proportion of Canada's voting population designated as "foreign-born" was only 6.62 per cent in 1911. The influx of settlers into the country since then, and the efflux of English-speaking men during the past three years of war, possibly may have increased that proportion to ten per cent, and only a portion of this number is of enemy origin. For the sake of eliminating a fraction of the total vote the Government would inflict a gross injustice on law-abiding members of the community.

The Act proposes to disfranchise two classes of people in Canada. All conscientious objectors to the war would be prevented from voting at the next general election, and all citizens of alien enemy birth or near extraction. That means that German Mennonites and the Doukhobors would be ruled out in the first class, and probably the members of the Society of Friends, whose loyalty has never been questioned, and that all the Ruthenians, Austrians, Hungarians, and Germans who live in the northerly districts of Alberta, Saskatchewan and Manitoba would largely compose the second class.

Few of the German population of the West have come directly from Germany to Canada. The majority of them have been classed among the immigrants who have crossed over the line from the United States. One-third of the so-called American settlers in the West are of Teutonic origin. Many of them, although born in Austria or Germany had become thoroughly Americanized before coming to this country, but they are disfranchised in the present Bill.

At no time since the war began have the Austrian or German people of the West given the authorities any trouble. The very act of disfranchising those foreigners who have been naturalized, especially the Ruthenians, who have entered most generally into the political

life of the West, will tend to solidify them, and even arouse hostility towards constituted authority. This Act will make enemies out of thousands of men and women who have become Canadians in spirit and outlook. The mere loss of their ballots will not mean much to one political party or the other, but the enactment of a hostile law by the Government of Canada, which made a contract of citizenship with them when they entered the country, will create a potential animosity which the Dominion can ill-afford to invite.

The Dominion Government has thrust the responsibility of making Canadians out of the new peoples from other countries upon the provinces. In the case of the young provinces of the West that duty has been particularly onerous during the past twelve years. Alberta, Saskatchewan and Manitoba were confronted with the problem of assimilating the hordes of new settlers which descended upon them between the years 1902 and 1914. The coming of the war stopped the influx of new citizens from Europe, and made a breathing spell in which the West was able to recover itself from the rush of immigration days. The schools, colleges and universities of the West have done great work in meeting the urgent national demand for education. On the other hand, the different nationalities from Europe have had a beneficial effect upon the life of the western plains. Professor W. C. Murray of the University of Saskatchewan, in an address at Saskatoon two years ago, said: "The life of this province is being greatly enriched by the artistic, literary and musical gifts which they and their people are bringing to us. We of Canadian birth do not realize to the full how much Saskatchewan owes to European culture. Every musical festival, each convention, be it grain growers, homemakers or municipalities, but deepens the conviction that their high character is due to the training and culture of Britain and the continent of Europe." Interference at this time with the important process of assimilation, which is being directed so conscientiously by the educationists of the western provinces, will do untold injury to the life of the whole Dominion.

The proposed disfranchisement Act is also a breach with the best traditions of the British Empire. Let the politicians at Ottawa take their cue on this question from that great patriot, General Smuts, whose speeches stirred London so deeply last spring. Speaking on the future of South Africa, he set down the soundest of Imperial principles when he said: "We want to create a blend out of various nationalities. We want to create a new nation, and that is the South African nation. If we succeed in doing that we shall achieve a nation not standing on one leg, but on various legs. We shall have a nation which will embrace various traits. You will have a people all blending into one. It is only by bringing about a union like that, and by making the different racial types of people work together, respect each other, co-operate with each other, and understand each other, that you will bring into being a unanimous people which will take the broadest and largest view of the problems with which it is confronted."

In this fiftieth anniversary of Confederation it would be a poor monument indeed to place among the laws of Canada, one which would be calculated to subvert rather than perpetuate the idea of a Canadian nationality.

I submit that the character of this measure cannot be better characterized than by this article of the Globe. This Bill also deprives the conscientious objectors of the right to vote. These people, Mennonites and Dukhobors, came here on the invitation of the Government. They had objections to military service, and left their countries of origin on account of military service, and they were granted this privilege by Orders in Council passed by the Government in 1873 and 1898. And now this Government wants to break faith with these people and to deprive them of their vote. The Minister of Justice (Mr. Doherty) does not seem to take great interest in this measure; he seems to have left it entirely in the charge of the Secretary of State (Mr. Meighen), which leads me to believe that this measure is brought into this House for the purpose of wresting the West from the Liberal party, and preventing a majority of Liberal members from being elected in the western provinces. The Government know that if they want to stay in power they must get a majority in the West. They know that Quebec will give a strong majority for the Liberal party, as Ontario may give a strong majority for the Conservative party, that the Maritime Provinces together may give a majority to the Liberal party, and if the Government want to stay in power they must certainly get a majority in the western provinces. The larger number of aliens reside in those provinces, and the Government wants to prevent those people from voting for the Liberals, as a large number of them have done in the past. Those people have not been guilty of any sedition or disloyalty, and some of them, according to the statements of my hon. friend from Saskatoon (Mr. McCraney) and my hon. friend from Strathcona (Mr. Douglas) contributed largely to the Patriotic Fund, some of their sons have gone to the front, and some have offered their services, but have been refused. A great many of these people, Galicians, Ruthenians and Bukowinians, are Slavs and are not of Teutonic origin. Their sympathies are with Russia and the Allies in this war, rather than with the Central Powers.

Although only a few in my constituency will be deprived of their votes, I thought it was my duty to protest. Even if one of my constituents were deprived of his vote, I would be lacking in my duty if I did not rise and protest against the measure, which I can only characterize as un-British. There

was a war in South Africa seventeen years ago, and this country sent seven or eight thousand soldiers to that country, and spent half a million dollars to vindicate for the British subjects in South Africa the right to exercise their franchise. When the Government of the Transvaal wanted to deprive the British subjects who had resided there for twenty years of their right to vote, England declared war against the President of the Transvaal, and the colonies came to the rescue. England spent hundreds of millions of dollars, and many thousands of British soldiers died on the field of battle, and some hundreds of Canadian soldiers lost their lives, only to vindicate the right of British subjects to exercise the franchise. Now they want to disfranchise citizens who came here fifteen years ago, who have been loyal to the British flag, and it is only for one purpose—to get them back into power.

Mr. G. H. BOIVIN (Shefford): Since the stirring incidents of Saturday evening, I have had occasion to read over in French and English the Bill which is at present before the House, and the principle of which we are discussing upon the second reading. I have searched in that Bill to find a good point, and have been unable to find any. I find that the Bill as drafted is an insult to British loyalty, and to the great majority of the people of Canada. First, it is an insult to the majority of the people of Canada because this Government, in introducing this Bill, brands a certain portion of our population as absolutely disloyal to the Crown: they have served faithfully and well for the past 15 years. The Secretary of State, in introducing the Bill at page 5725 of the Unrevised Hansard said, speaking at that time of the aliens who are naturalized citizens of Canada, and who are being deprived of their vote:

> Not only is it unfair to them that they should be asked to decide the destiny and the vigour of a war against their brothers in Europe, but it is unfair to the rest of the population that they should have the right to so decide.

How could they, by their vote, decide the vigour of the war which is being waged against their brothers, unless, Mr. Speaker, that statement means that in voting for a Liberal candidate and the Liberal party they will be doing less for the British Empire and for the war than if they voted for our good friends on the other side of the House? What right has the Secretary of State, or any man in this House, to brand the Liberal party as disloyal? Have not our members on this side of the House given just as freely and just as willingly of their sons, and of their flesh and blood, to the defence of the Empire?

Mr. LALOR: No?

Mr. BOIVIN: Have not the Liberals from one end of Canada to the other enlisted just as freely as the Conservatives? Do hon. members on the other side contend that the Conservatives are the only people who have enlisted in this war? The difference between the two parties is this; that if the Liberal party is returned to power during the coming election, the war will be continued as it has been waged since the beginning. The soldiers of Canada will be members of a volunteer army fighting with vigour and enthusiasm, boys who are willing to fight for their King and country, and if the Conservative party is returned to power, what shall we see? We shall see a conscript army where you will have to be prodding the soldier in the back with a sword to make him fight. That is the difference between the two parties. The policy of the Liberal party has been laid down and published in the press of this country, under the signature of my right hon. leader Sir Wilfrid Laurier, who tells us, not that he wishes to relax in any way the part that Canada is taking in this war, but that he desires to consult the Mother Country, and to apply the energies of Canada in the way which will do the most good to the Mother Country. He promises a vigourous recruiting campaign, and he assures the people of Canada and of the Empire at large that Canada will maintain her position in this war as a free and autonomous colony of the British Empire. The Liberals cannot be branded as disloyal. They have contributed generously to the Patriotic Fund, to all the different relief funds which have been working throughout the country, and it is from the Liberal side of this House that the statement has been made, and that motions have been made which have been turned down by the other side, that the people of Canada, as a whole, and the Government of Canada should not rely on public charity to look after the welfare of the wives aand children of soldiers who are fighting for us on the other side of the ocean, but that this patriotic duty should be performed by the Government itself. I feared that I misunderstood the Secretary of State, and I kept on reading his remarks.

I find the following words a few lines further down.

> It is because of the reasons I have mentioned, namely, that those who cannot in the nature of things be absolutely divorced in sym-

pathy or sentiment from the peoples from whom they come should not be permitted, in justice to the rest of the population, to exercise a measure of control over the destinies of the war against those peoples, because it would be unfair to them to ask them to go to the polls and vote on an issue which decides to a degree the vigour, the purpose and the destiny of that war.

I dissent emphatically from that statement. I find coupled with that another statement, as follows:

It is also because war service should be the basis of war franchise. The two should go hand in hand—the obligation and the privilege.

The hon. gentleman says that war service should be the basis of war franchise; war service by whom? If he had said that war service in so far as the elector is concerned, should be the basis of war franchise, I would agree with him. But that is not the position which he takes. He does not say that the women of Canada who have worked faithfully during three or four years, day and night, knitting socks for the soldiers, collecting funds for the patriotic and red cross work, are entitled to the vote. No; that is not service in the eyes of the Secretary of State. What he considers to be service is to stay at home, draw money from the Patriotic Fund, draw money from the Government, spend the separation allowance—and then vote; that is what he considers to be service. He bases the franchise of the woman who remains at home on the service of the soldier who has gone across the ocean and is fighting on the other side for Canada and the Empire. He ignores the service which is rendered here at home. He ignores the service rendered by the wife of the munition worker—the man who for the past two or three years has been going day in and day out to these munition plants, where the gases, which have practically ruined vegetation for miles around, have the same effect upon the human system as they have upon nature—he ignores the services of the wife who ministered daily to the wants of the husband as he came home from the munition plant, being well aware that he was dying a slow death for Canada and for the Empire. Yet this woman is to be deprived of the vote, and this man who is working in the munition factory will be deprived of the vote if he happens to be an alien who became naturalized in Canada within the last fifteen years.

The member for Calgary (Mr. R. B. Bennett) brought up what he considered to be a new phase of the question; he gave us a definition of the word "nationals." The Conservative party always have to be coupled up with some other organization. When it is not the nationals, it is the Nationalists; when it is not the Nationalists, it is the nationals. To-day they are coupling themselves up with the nationals. What, after all, is the definition of a national? A man who is naturalized here in Canada? A man who is the possessor of a Canadian naturalization certificate? No; a man who can be obliged to go and fight on the other side; a man who will perform active military service. If the Government wish to be consistent, why do they not disfranchise every man who is too old to fight? These aliens who have been in this country since 1902 have done their share in this war. They have contributed very generously in certain cities of Canada to Patriotic and Red Cross Funds and to the Belgian Relief Fund; those who have not contributed in that way have felt the pinch of the high cost of living due to the war. After paying directly and indirectly for several years their share of taxation for the carrying on of the war, they are told that they have not the right to vote. The Government borrowed every dollar they could raise in Canada at five per cent; then they crossed to the United States and paid six per cent to the Americans, to get money to pay the interest charges on the money which they had borrowed at home. The aliens in Canada of alien birth are helping to pay these charges: yet they are not to have the right to vote. Where is the good old British motto of "No taxation without representation?" These men are being taxed, yet they are to have no right to decide who shall govern this country. What about the statement concerning "the scrap of paper?" When we entered this war Liberals and Conservatives alike on recruiting platforms in the province of Quebec—and I dare say in every part of Canada—referred often to the action of the German Government in violating the neutrality of Belgium; of tearing up the treaty of years gone by, which was considered by them as a mere "scrap of paper." What about the promises made to these aliens who came into Canada in 1902—promises made by the Minister of the Interior in every administration, by the present leader of the Opposition when he was Prime Minister, by the present Prime Minister? According to the promises made, these people were to enjoy the privileges of

British subjects in Canada. The present leader of the Opposition has kept his word; he is respecting his promise; he is voting and acting accordingly in the House of Commons. But because it suits the convenience of hon. gentlemen opposite to deprive these people of their votes; because they fear that they may vote for the Liberal party; because they fear that these people will consider that they can obtain more economic advantages in this country by voting for the Liberal party, the Government will deprive them of the vote. They might well have reflected: We have done so many things which were wrong; we have spent the money of the people so ruthlessly since we have been in power, that we feel sure, even though we deprive these aliens of their votes, that we shall still not have enough votes to win the election; we will, therefore, give votes to the soldiers, not only to the Canadian soldiers, but to those who never lived in Canada, never paid a cent of taxation in Canada, and do not know anything about the administration of this country. They are fighting for the Allies, the same as the British, French and American soldiers; but they happen to be enlisted in the Canadian army, and we will give them the right to vote; we will give them the right to put their votes where they want to put them, in whatever constituency they may choose; but we will take the vote from the alien who has paid taxes for years.

It is evident that the purpose of bringing down this legislation was not that of winning the war, but that of winning the forthcoming election. The proof of that is the statement which I have already referred to, that service should be the basis of war franchise, and that war service should be interpreted as relationship with the soldier who happens to be fighting for us on the other side of the ocean. If that is the way service is to be measured, it is only fair to argue that the sister who happens to have two brothers fighting on the other side of the ocean should have two votes, because she is giving more service to the country than the sister who has only one.

Another conclusion would, perhaps, be that those who have given their sons in death to the Emplre, whose sons have sacrificed their lives for their King and country, should have more votes than those whose relatives have come back with only one arm or with only one hand. That would be a logical conclusion, if we are going to accept the argument taken by the Solicior General, who says that service is to be the basis. If service of the man overseas is to be the basis and not the service of the person at home, it would be just as logical to say that the minor children of the soldiers should vote—I am frank to say that it will require the votes of

1 a.m.

the minor children to win this election for the Conservative party, and I am very much surprised that this provision has not been included in the Bill. The Government were anxious enough to include anything and everything. Why did they not include in the Bill a provision by which the minor children of our soldiers could vote, and by which the Conservative local candidate would be appointed tutor to those minor children to see that they voted right? That would be about as reasonable as the Bill which is now before us. That is not all. People, if their names do not happen to be upon the list as made by the enumerator of the Conservative party, must take an oath that they have a right to vote. I am afraid the Solicitor General has made a mistake in drawing up the formula of the oath that appears in this Bill. He should have stipulated that a man, before he is given the right to vote, must solemnly swear and affirm that he will vote for the Conservative party. That has not been done. It should have been done; otherwise I fear the Conservative party, by introducing this measure, will be hurting the fair name of Canada by discouraging immigration for years after the war without doing any good to itself and certainly without doing any good to our common country.

The House divided on the amendment of Sir Wilfrid Laurier, which was declared negatived on the following division:

YEAS.

Messieurs:

Boivin,	Lapointe (Montreal, St. James),
Bourassa,	Lemieux,
Boyer,	Maclean (Halifax),
Buchanan,	McCraney,
Cardin,	McCrea,
Copp,	Martin,
Delisle,	Michaud,
Devlin,	Murphy,
Douglas,	Oliver,
Ethier,	Pacaud,
Fortier,	Papineau,
Gauthier (St. Hyacinthe),	Pugsley,
Kay,	Ross,
Kyte,	Seguin,
Lachance,	Sinclair,
Lanctot,	Tobin,
Lapointe (Kamouraska),	Verville.—34.

NAYS.

Messieurs:

Armstrong (Lambton),	Morphy,
Bennett (Simcoe),	Morris,
Best,	Munson,
Boys,	Nicholson,
Brabazon,	Nickle,
Bristol,	Paul,
Burrell,	Rainville,
Cochrane,	Robidoux,
Cromwell,	Roche,
Donaldson,	Schaffner,
Edwards,	Scott,
Foster (Sir George)	Sevigny,
Glass,	Sexsmith,
Green,	Shepherd,
Hanna,	Stevens,
Hartt,	Stewart (Hamilton),
Hazen,	Sutherland,
Lalor,	Taylor,
Lewis,	Thoburn,
Maclean (York, O.),	Thompson (Yukon),
McCurdy,	Thornton,
McLean (Queens, P.E.I.),	Wallace,
Meighen,	Webster.—46.

PAIRS.

Ministerial.	Opposition.
Alguire,	McMillan,
Ames, Sir Herbert,	Delisle,
Arthurs,	Truax,
Ball,	Turgeon,
Burnham,	Proulx,
Bennett, R. B.,	Hughes, J. J.,
Barnard,	Achim,
Borden, Sir Robert,	Bickerdike,
Bowman,	Warnock,
Boyce,	Brouillard,
Bradbury,	Cruise,
Currie,	Demers,
Chabot,	Beland,
Champagne,	MacNutt,
Cockshutt,	Charlton,
Clark, Hugh,	German,
Crothers,	McCoig,
Davidson,	Carroll,
Elliot,	Marcil, J. E.,
Fripp,	Lafortune,
Henderson,	Gauvreau,
Jameson,	Power,
Kemp, Sir Edward,	Robb,
McLeod,	Carvell,
Marshall,	Neeley,
Middlebro,	Pardee,
Morrison,	Molloy,
Reid,	Laurier, Sir Wilfrid,
Rogers,	Loggie,
Smith,	Gordon,
Stanfield,	Macdonald,
Steele,	Bureau,
Stewart,	McKenzie,
Thoburn,	McCrea,
White, Sir Thomas,	Graham, Hon. Geo.,
White, G. V.,	White, W. H.,
Wilson, G. C.,	Wilson, C. A.,
Wright,	Mondou,
Weichel,	Nesbitt,

Mr. GRAHAM: I was paired with the Minister of Finance (Sir Thomas White). Had I voted I would have voted for the amendment.

Mr. PROULX: I was paired with the hon. member for Peterborough (Mr. Burnham). Had I voted I would have voted for the amendment.

Mr. McKENZIE: I was paired with the the hon. member for Lunenburg (Mr. D. Stewart). Had I voted I would have voted for the amendment.

Mr. NEELY: I was paired with the hon. member for East Elgin (Mr. Marshall). Had I voted I would have voted for the amendment.

Mr. BUREAU: I was paired with the hon. member for South Perth (Mr. Steele). Had I voted I would have voted for the amendment.

Mr. REID: I was paired with the right hon. leader of the Opposition (Sir Wilfrid Laurier). Had I voted I would have voted against the amendment.

Mr. BALL: I was paired with the hon. member for Gloucester (Mr. Turgeon). Had I voted I would have voted against the amendment.

Mr. ARTHURS: I was paired with the hon. member for South Bruce (Mr. Truax). Had I voted I would have voted against the amendment.

Mr. ELLIOTT: I was paired with the hon. member for Bagot (Mr. Marcile). Had I voted I would have voted against the amendment.

Mr. DAVIDSON: I was paired with the hon. member for South Cape Breton (Mr. Carroll). Had I voted I would have voted against the amendment.

Hon. WILLIAM PUGSLEY (St. John City): The hour is late, but there are a few minutes left to us before the guillotine will fall and we shall be deprived of the liberty of further expressing our views on the second reading of this Bill. I desire to give notice that before the conclusion of my remarks, I shall move, seconded by Mr. Sinclair,

That the said Bill be not now read a second time, but that it be resolved that in the opinion of this House it is not desirable, as provided by the said Bill, to disfranchise large numbers of the people of Canada who have taken the oath of allegiance, have been guaranteed the rights of citizenship in the name of His Majesty the King, and who have not failed to discharge all the obligations of citizenship.

And further that it be resolved that any measure granting the franchise only to a limited number of women, as proposed by the Bill, is contrary to the public interest and fails to recognize the splendid patriotic work which has been performed by the women of Canada generally during the present war.

There are one or two matters with which I should like to deal, and more especially with the observation of my hon. friend the member for Calgary (Mr. R. B. Bennett), who put forward the extraordinary proposition that there was no obligation whatever upon the part of the Government, as representing His Majesty the King, either to confer or to continue the right of franchise upon British subjects who had become such by reason of their having been naturalized. I was surprised at that statement of my hon. friend. In support of it he quoted certain language of one of the Lord Justices of England, but I am quite sure that that language must have been used with reference to a statute of the province of British Columbia whose authority was then in question; because, so far as the Parliament of Canada is concerned, no one would ever question its legal authority to take away from any citizen of Canada the right to exercise his franchise. That is within the power of Parliament, just as a provincial legislature in the exercise of the exclusive power conferred upon it by the British North American Act can deprive a citizen of his property without any compensation. But that I would say would be tyrannical, an arbitrary and an unjustifiable exercise of its power; no one would say that it was just or equitable for a provincial legislature, though it may have the power to do so, to deprive a man of his property without compensation. Now all that we say here is that the Parliament of Canada passed a law under which it provided certain means by which an alien may become a British subject, and it provides that when the conditions of naturalization are all fulfilled, by residence, by the necessary affidavits, and by the action of the court after public notice, the alien who so becomes a British subject becomes entitled to all the political and other rights, powers and privileges which belong to a natural-born British subject. Those are the words of the statute. Section 24 of the Naturalization Act, Chapter 77 of the Revised Statutes of Canada, says:

> An alien to whom a certificate of naturalization is granted shall, within Canada, be entitled to all political and other rights, powers and privileges, and be subject to all obligations to which a natural-born British subject is entitled or subject within Canada.

What words could be stronger or more emphatic? My hon. friend from Calgary seemed to distinguish in some way between political rights and the right of franchise. But Parliament does not limit the right of the naturalized British subject to political rights, but gives to him all the political rights, powers and privileges of a natural-born British subject. Now when these citizens of Canada became naturalized, they became British subjects within Canada with the same rights, powers and privileges, and subject to the same obligations, as natural-born British subjects. That is the privilege which the Canadian Government and the Canadian Parliament have held out to all people in all parts of the world. They have said through their legislation, if you come to Canada and qualify by reason of residence, and by the authority of the Court before which you appear you become a naturalized British subject, then in the future no distinction will be made between you and the man who is a natural-born British subject. Surely, Mr. Speaker, when the certificate of naturalization was given to these citizens declaring that they should have under the Canadian statute all the political and all the other rights, powers, and privileges which a natural-born British subject enjoys within Canada, that was a promise, a guarantee of the rights of citizenship, which ought not to be taken away so long as a naturalized citizen discharges the obligations which he assumed under section 24 of the statute, namely, that he should bear all the obligations borne by a natural-born British subject.

Now it is not pretended that these citizens whom it is proposed to disfranchise have not performed their obligations, but it is said that as they are exempted from military service, therefore it is in the interest of the State that the franchise should be taken away from them. That might be an argument if these men had come and asked this Parliament to exempt them from military service, but they have asked nothing of the kind.

No evidence has been submitted to this House of any desire on their part for military exemption, but this disfranchisement applies to every one of these naturalized military subjects who are above military age, and who are exempt from military service. Let me ask you, Sir, in the name of justice and fairplay, if, because you exempt from military service a young man between twenty and thirty-five, residing in Canada, it is any justification to take away the franchise from thousands upon thousands of men of the same race who are upwards of the age of thirty-five who cannot be called upon under the Military Service Act to perform military duty. Where is the justification for it? Is it not all a

pretense when those gentlemen come before this House and say that is the ground upon which they put it? If that is the ground, why did they not limit the disfranchisement to those young men of alien enemy origin who are exempted specially by the statute from military service? Surely these men, who have reached the age of thirty-five years and are given the guarantee of all the rights, political and otherwise which appertain to the natural-born British subjects, are entitled to retain their franchise just the same as British-born subjects who have attained the age of thirty-five, in neither case is there any liability for military service, both classes are by law British subjects, the one is a natural-born British subject the other is a naturalized British subject. They are both declared by law to have the same political rights, powers, and privileges. And so I ask you upon what principle of justice shall one be treated differently from the other? I say it is all a pretense, and I shall tell you why I say so. There was an assurance—and I have every reason to believe it because I have it on very high authority—that if our western Liberal friends who were in favour of conscription would come in and help to form a union government this measure of disfranchisement would not be introduced. I have the proof in the procedure before this Parliament, and it is that there was no exemption of those naturalized British subjects in the Military Service Act. They were to be liable to serve, just as the British-born were liable to serve, but when the union government fell through, after the piteous appeals which those gentlemen upon the other side were making to our Liberal friends in the West, confessing to them in effect that they had so lost the confidence of the people that they felt they could not successfully carry on the war, and urging and beseeching our Liberal friends in the West especially to join them in the formation of a union government, they come down with this disfranchisement Bill and put in this Bill relating to the franchise the extraordinary provision, which they omitted entirely from the Military Service Act, exempting those naturalized British subjects from military service. They put it in this Franchise Bill because the Military Service Act had passed before the union government scheme had fallen through. Then they propose to disfranchise this large class of citizens, and in order to make it appear that there was some justification for it, they exempt a portion of these men from military service. I am satisfied that the hon. gentleman sitting upon the treasury benches, and the hon. gentlemen behind them who have forced them in caucus to bring down this measure, have been justly charged with the fact that this Bill is to enable them to win an election. Some gentlemen of the Government say: "Well, suppose that is so; if it is we are proud of it, if it is likely to enable us to win an election." Well, a burglar may try to break in and steal, and he may be foiled in his purpose, and so gentlemen who would steal an election from the honest voters of the country may be foiled in their purpose. The only offence charged against these people is that the gentlemen who occupy the treasury benches think they are actuated by Liberal principles. Liberalism means liberty and freedom, and when the people realize the attempt which is being made to commit a great outrage upon a most deserving portion of the population, I think they will resent it and punish those who are the authors of such an infamous measure. In the election the Italian navvy working on the railroad or working in the trenches will have a vote, but the men out on the western prairie, the naturalized British subjects, who are affected by this Bill, who came to our western country nineteen years ago—because this Bill goes back that far—settling in the province of Saskatchewan, out upon the lonely prairie, in a district where there was no railroad, no hamlet, a long distance from all the comforts of civilization, those men who have spent the best part of their lives there building up homes for themselves and their families, and who have taken a splendid part in producing what is needed for the Empire during this war, are deprived of their vote. Those men who have real substance in the country, men who have been working to build up the country are to have no right to say how the country shall be governed during the next five years.

My hon. friends upon the other side try to make the country believe that this is but a war-time measure, only to last during the war. Have they put in this Bill a clause that there shall be a dissolution of Parliament after the war is over? Not much. If they are elected under this Bill, they will be able to hold office for five years after the election, and will be able to administer all the general affairs of the country, whether arising out of the war, or connected with the war, or otherwise.

Let me call your attention to the provision of the Bill referred to in this proposed amendment, the provision relating to women. The amendment I propose moving declares that any measure granting the franchise only to a limited number of women, as proposed in the Bill, is contrary to the public interest and fails to recognize the splendid patriotic work which has been performed by the women engaged generally during the present war. I desire to express my entire agreement with hon. gentlemen upon this side of the House, as well as upon the other side, who have said it is eminently proper that the near relatives of those who have gone to the front should receive the franchise in the coming election. But, let us consider, for a moment, upon what it is based. It is not, and cannot be, based upon the service which is given by men at the front. If it were, as my hon. friend from Shefford (Mr. Boivin) pointed out, the vote could not be given equally. I instance a case which comes within my own knowledge. A very dear friend of mine has three boys who have been at the front since the war broke out. These boys have only one sister, only one female relative. It would not be fair, as the hon. member for Shefford has said, that there should be only one vote to represent those three boys. I know another case of one man who has gone to the front, and whose six or seven female relatives will have votes under this Act. Surely if the franchise was given on the theory that it is for the service of men at the front, that would be a very unequal representation, because in the one case there are seven ladies voting representing one man, and in another one lady representing three men. Sir, it is based and must be based upon the service which the women themselves have rendered to this country, based upon the sacrifices which they have made in parting from their sons, their husbands, their brothers. It must be based upon service, and it can be based upon nothing else. Their service to the country has been great. Their sacrifice has been great, and every member will agree that it is manifestly proper that their services should be recognized and they should be given the vote. But while that is true, is it just that the women of the country who have performed such splendid service during this war should be deprived of the opportunity equally with the others of saying how this country shall be governed for the next five years? Upon what ground is it based? The women generally of this country have, as my proposed amendment states, performed splendid service. Will it be said that they have not shown that they are entitled to the franchise just as much as the men of this country are entitled to it? Can it be based upon the ground that the issues in the next election are simply to be issues connected with the war? I saw the other day that a prominent gentleman in British Columbia took that ground. He referred to the Canadian Northern Railway Bill at a public meeting, and said that in ordinary times the action of the Government in putting that Bill before Parliament would induce the people to say that they had brought ignominy and shame and disgrace upon this country; but, he said, because the war is on I must vote for them and support them. But that is not going to be the view the people of this country generally will take. They will say that the boys at the front must be supported; that every possible effort should be made to win the war. But the question will be, who will take part in the governing of the country to enable the war to be won? Many questions will come up for the consideration of the electorate; some will take one side, others the other side. And let me say to my hon. friends that they must not expect the people, the electors at large, will not desire to take all these questions into consideration. They will look, and properly look, at the way in which this Government has managed the affairs of this country, both matters connected with the war and other matters of administration, during the years they have been in power, and will determine whether or not it is in the best interests of the country to longer entrust the administration to their hands.

You say I have but one minute longer, Mr. Speaker? I shall avail myself of that one minute to say that I think it is a most reprehensible thing that, on a matter of such enormous importance as the disfranchising of thousands and thousands of the electors of this country, the conferring of the franchise upon a portion of the women of this country, we should have, on the very first day of the discussion upon the second reading of this Bill, the application of the closure, so that reasonable and fair opportunity for discussing this measure is refused. The question is so important that a very much larger time ought to be given to it. The people of this country are entitled to be informed. Hon. gentlemen think that because we cannot convince them we have no right to speak. I trust that, through the press, our voices will go beyond

be heard by the great court of the nation, tne court to which hon. gentlemen opposite and we must soon appeal and submit our case. And I ask, is it not contrary to all reason and fair play to the people of this country that a measure of this enormous importance should be pressed through by closure on the very day succeeding the motion for the second reading, which is the first opportunity given in this Parliament for a full and fair discussion? Is it treating the people of this country fairly? I submit that it is not. This country is many thousand miles in extent. There are, I venture to say, thousands of people in Canada who have not yet heard of the contents of this Bill; men engaged upon the farms, men who receive their newspapers only weekly, men who have many other subjects to engage their attention. It takes days for them to learn what is going on in this Parliament, even to learn what is going on, to say nothing of getting particulars of the proposed legislation.

I will not trespass for one single instant upon the time of the House; but I desire to say that I do believe, and I think it will be the verdict of the people of this country, that never in the history of Canada has there been, and I trust that never again in the history of Canada will there be, a measure so unjust, a measure so objectionable in its character, a measure so incapable of defence from every reasonable standpoint, as the measure which is now before the House.

Mr. LEMIEUX and Sir GEORGE FOSTER having risen together:

Mr. SPEAKER: The hon. member for Rouville asked if I would see him next, and I have to do so.

Hon. RODOLPHE LEMIEUX (Rouville): This measure is certainly the most important that has come up before Parliament for many years, and, as my friend the member for St. John (Mr. Pugsley) has just said, it means the disfranchising of thousands and thousands of Canadians, full-fledged British subjects. I only regret that we have to discuss this question at this late hour and under such circumstances. Some years ago, in reading an account of the sinking of the Titanic in mid-ocean, I was struck with the last words uttered by the captain of the ship. Those who were saved on that memorable night said that they heard the voice of the captain telling his crew: Be British. These were the last words uttered by that gallant captain, so the confines of this room and that we shall faithful to the best traditions of Great Britain on the sea. Sir, it seems to me that the captain of the ship of state could give us to-day some words of the same nature. But as I see the Tory ship sinking on the eve of a general election, I am afraid that the voice of the captain is uttering other words than those of the gallant captain of the Titanic. He is telling his crew to be Prussians and to be Hunnish. This measure is most unjust, most unfair, and most ungenerous. A Bill such as this would delight the heart of any junker in Germany. It would be hailed with pleasure, with enthusiasm by General Caranza or, if he were living, by General Huerta, in Mexico.

We have been told this afternoon, in very eloquent terms, the causes of the war in South Africa. The hon. gentleman from Guysborough (Mr. Sinclair) told us what happened in the Boer republic when the franchise was refused to the British subjects. I had intended to quote from the first chapter of the book which had a great circulation at the time of the declaration of war against the Boer republic, entitled "The Transvaal from Within," by Sir Percy Fitzpatrick. I shall not quote from it, because my hon. friend gave us the causes of the war in South Africa and the reasons why men from all parts of the British Empire went to South Africa, in order to stand by the men of British birth who were refused their rights by the President of the Boer republic. Let me, however, quote the memorial signed by the president of the Reform Committee in the Transvaal Republic. The great grievance, indeed the most conspicuous grievance, of the British subject in the Transvaal was the refusal by the Boer Government of the franchise. The memorial says:

> Our great effort, however, was the petition for the franchise with the moderate terms of which you are all acquainted. The petition was signed by more than 38,000 persons. What was the result? We were called unfaithful for not naturalizing ourselves when naturalization means only that we should give up our original citizenship and get nothing in return, and become subject to disabilities.

Further on the memorial says:

> We have now only two questions to consider:—

Says Mr. Leonard, chairman of the Transvaal National Union, summing up the grievances of the British subjects:

> —(a) What do we want? (b) How shall we get it? I have stated plainly what our grievances are, and I shall answer with equal directness the question, "What do we want?" We want: The establishment of this republic as a true republic; (2) a Grondwet or constitu-

tion which shall be framed by competent persons selected by representatives of the whole people and framed on lines laid down by them —a constitution which shall be safeguarded against hasty alteration; (3) an equitable franchise law, and fair representation; (4) equality of the Dutch and English languages.

Sir, in South Africa the British subjects, being refused their franchise, revolted and called the Britons from all parts of the British Empire to come to their rescue, and they came to the rescue for that very purpose. I remember the occasion when the resolution was presented to the House of Commons. I was then one of the budding members of that Chamber. I had been elected in 1896, and that resolution was presented by the then Prime Minister (Sir Wilfrid Laurier) and seconded by the present Minister of Trade and Commerce (Sir George Foster) in 1897. My hon. friend from Guysborough (Mr. Sinclair) quoted from the speech delivered by the then Prime Minister of Canada the resolution which was adopted unanimously by the members of the House. But there is another speech which should arrest the attention of the hon. gentlemen who sit at your right, Mr. Speaker, the members who belong to the Orange lodges. I remember the speech delivered on that occasion by one of the most eminent of the Orange leaders in Canada. I refer to the late Clarke Wallace, father of the present member for Centre York, who used the following language:

British subjects have been deprived of the rights of citizenship which Great Britain has given in every land where her flag has waved. We in Canada have given a conspicuous example of that because here the fullest measure of freedom and liberty has been given to those who are not British born. We may perhaps say that greater freedom has been given by Great Britain than by any other nation to those not native born, because we have been examples of the great liberality with the most successful and satisfactory results. I desire to add my word of commendation to the resolution proposed by the right hon. leader of the Government (Sir Wilfrid Laurier).

Here is the language of a gentleman who, in his day and generation, was the most eminent member of the Orange Order, and he stood in his place in Parliament and supported the leader of the Government and his friend the present Minister of Trade and Commerce (Sir George Foster). He stood by them, because the franchise had been refused the British-born in South Africa by Paul Kruger. I wish that the men who belong to the Orange lodges would follow in the footsteps of the late Clarke Wallace, and remember the timely words he uttered on that historic occasion.

The present Government sitting to your right, Mr. Speaker, is only there on sufferance. The life of this Parliament has been extended, and I regret, Mr. Speaker, having assented to that extension. I was under the impression that that extension was granted last year to carry on the war, as was stated at the time, but what has happened? The Government, despite the pledges that were given by its members, forced through, first, a conscription measure, thus sowing the seed of disunion amongst a united people. The Government has—how shall I say it—Siftonized a deal of stupendous magnitude by this Canadian Northern transaction, adding six hundred millions to the national debt of Canada. And now the Government comes at the end of this session with a Bill, not of enfranchisement, but of disfranchisement, making of the most solemn pledges and of our naturalization laws so many "scraps of paper," so that, at the next general election, Hun-like, yes, Kaiser-like, they may hack their way through the constituencies of Canada. My hon. friend from St. John (Mr. Pugsley) expressed surprise that closure had been used on this occasion. I am not surprised that closure has been adopted. The instrument is worthy of the occasion. This is class legislation, and reactionary legislation. The Tory Government is reverting to mediæval times, when foreigners were only tolerated in so-called civilized countries, and were hardly recognized as human beings.

We hear the suggestion at almost every turn: cease to be Liberals; forget your party ties and your party relations; be Canadians; be British, so that we may win the war. Yet a most un-British, a most un-Canadian measure is proposed by the Government, to serve, under the cover of patriotism, the most selfish party ends of the Tory party. This Bill emphasizes more than ever the essential and radical difference between Liberalism and Conservatism. Gladstone was a great reformer in the sense of extending the franchise; as a matter of fact, any one who has read the history of the Mother Country knows that the Reform Bills were introduced and passed by Liberal governments as they were opposed by Tory oppositions. The great Gladstone has given to the following definition of Liberalism and Conservatism:

The principle of Liberalism is trust in the people, qualified by prudence; the principle of Conservatism is mistrust of the people, qualified by fear.

I am prouder than ever of my Liberalism and of the guiding principle of my political faith; trust in the people. The present measure introduced by the Government shows exactly where the Tory party always stands. The Tory party stands for privileges, for class legislation, for mistrust of the people, qualified by fear of the electorate. The old conception of society was a conception of classes. Human beings in the old days—not so very old after all; in the beginning of the last century—were graded and standardized; certain privileges were reserved to certain groups. The first Reform Bill was introduced by an ancestor of one of the great Governor Generals, Lord Grey; others came later from G adstone and from leaders of Liberal and Radical governments. These Reform Bills were so many steps towards equal rights.

Sir, we have brought to Canada immigrants from all parts of the world. We have advertised Canada as the land of the free. We promised the immigrants equality of rights. They were living in Europe in their native lands in a state of serfdom; we gave them freedom as they came within our gates. The nationalities spread over the famous and historic Balkan peninsula have been living in serfdom, some under the yoke of Austria, others under the yoke of Turkey. Do you think that the men who lived in serfdom in those countries have any regard for the masters whom they left, for the yoke from which they were freed? As I read the other day a passage from a very interesting book on immigration, it dawned upon me that it was not possible that a Galician, for instance, although an Austrian subject, would have any regard for Austria; that on the contrary, having sworn allegiance to His Majesty the King and become a full-fledged British subject settled in the great far West, the possessor, indeed, the proprietor of 700 acres of land—would always side with Canada and Britain in preference to Austria. Speaking of the Galician, Mr. Woodsworth, in his excellent book on immigration, "Strangers within our Gates," says:

> He is ambitious. He is eager to become Canadianized. He does not cling to a language which is rich in words that express sorrow and despondency and misery, and meagre in those that express aspiration and joy and hope. Above all, he yearns to get on the land and to own some acres of his own. A Roman Catholic priest tells of conducting a Galician and his wife to a quarter-section he had helped them to secure for homesteading. The man could hardly believe that the land on which he stood was, on certain conditions, to be actually his own.

The House divided on the amendment of Mr. Pugsley, which was declared negatived on the following division:

YEAS.

Messieurs:

Barrette,	Lapointe, (Montreal, St. James)
Boivin,	Lemieux,
Bourassa,	Maclean (Halifax),
Boyer,	McCraney,
Buchanan,	McCrea,
Cardin,	Martin,
Copp,	Michaud,
Delisle,	Murphy,
Devlin,	Oliver,
Douglas,	Pacaud,
Ethier,	Papineau,
Fortier,	Pugsley,
Gauthier (St. Hyacinthe),	Ross,
Kay,	Seguin,
Kyte,	Sinclair,
Lachance,	Tobin,
Lanctot,	Verville.—35.
Lapointe (Kamouraska),	

NAYS.

Messieurs:

Armstrong (Lambton),	Meighen,
Bellemare,	Morphy,
Bennett (Simcoe),	Morris,
Best,	Munson,
Boys,	Nicholson,
Brabazon,	Nickle,
Bristol,	Paul,
Burrell,	Rainville,
Clarke (Wellington),	Robidoux,
Cochrane,	Roche,
Cromwell,	Schaffner,
Donaldson,	Scott,
Edwards,	Sevigny,
Foster (Sir George)	Sexsmith,
Glass,	Shepherd,
Green,	Stevens,
Hanna,	Stewart (Hamilton),
Hazen,	Sutherland,
Lalor,	Taylor,
Lewis,	Thoburn,
Maclean (York, O.),	Thompson (Yukon),
McCurdy,	Thornton,
McLean (Queens, P.E.I.),	Wallace,
	Webster.—47.

PAIRS.

Ministerial.	Opposition.
Alguire,	McMillan,
Ames, Sir Herbert,	Delisle,
Arthurs,	Truax,
Ball,	Turgeon,
Burnham,	Proulx,
Bennett, R. B.,	Hughes, J. J.,
Barnard,	Achim,
Borden, Sir Robert,	Bickerdike,
Bowman,	Warnock,
Boyce,	Brouillard,
Bradbury,	Cruise,
Currie,	Demers,
Chabot,	Beland,
Champagne,	MacNutt,
Cockshutt,	Charlton,
Clark, Hugh,	German,
Crothers,	McCoig,
Davidson,	Carroll,
Elliot,	Marcil, J. E.,

Fripp,	Lafortune,
Henderson,	Gauvreau,
Jameson,	Power,
Kemp, Sir Edward,	Robb,
McLeod,	Carvell,
Marshall,	Neeley,
Middlebro,	Pardee,
Morrison,	Molloy,
Reid,	Laurier, Sir Wilfrid,
Rogers,	Loggie,
Smith,	Gordon,
Stanfield,	Macdonald,
Steele,	Bureau,
Stewart, Dugald,	McKenzie,
Thoburn,	McCrea,
White, Sir Thomas,	Graham, Hon. Geo.,
White, G. V.,	White, W. H.,
Wilson, G. C.,	Wilson, C. A.,
Wright,	Mondou,
Weichel,	Nesbitt,

Mr. GRAHAM: I was paired with the Minister of Finance (Sir Thomas White). Had I voted, I would have voted for the amendment.

Mr. PROULX: I was paired with the hon. member for West Peterborough (Mr. Burnham. Had I voted, I would have voted for the amendment.

Mr. REID: I was paired with the right hon. leader of the Opposition (Sir Wilfrid Laurier). Had I voted, I would have voted against the amendment.

Mr. ELLIOTT: I was paired with the hon. member for Bagot (Mr. Marcile). Had I voted, I would have voted against the amendment.

Mr. BUREAU: I was paired with the hon. member for South Perth (Mr. Steele). Had I voted, I would have voted for the amendment.

Mr. DOHERTY: I was paired with the hon. member for Bonaventure (Mr. Marcil). Had I voted, I should have voted against the amendment.

Mr. ARTHURS: I was paired with the hon. member for South Bruce (Mr. Truax). Had I voted, I would have voted against the amendment.

Mr. BALL: I was paired with the hon. member for Gloucester (Mr. Turgeon). Had I voted, I would have voted against the amendment.

Main motion for the second reading of the Bill agreed to on the same division reversed, and Bill read the second time.

On motion of Sir George Foser, the House adjourned at 2.15 a.m. (Tuesday.)

Tuesday, September 11, 1917.

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

EXPENSES OF PARLIAMENTARY SESSIONS.

RECOMMENDATION OF THE COMMITTEE THAT THE INQUIRY BE CONTINUED NEXT SESSION.

Mr. W. B. NORTHRUP (E. Hastings) presented the report of the Select Committee appointed by the House to act with a like committee of the Senate to consider and, during the present session, report the total cost, including incidental expenses, of each session of Parliament and the best way, if any, of reducing the same.

Your committee regret that they have so far been unable to make much progress with the inquiry entrusted to them, and would, in view of the importance of an inquiry of this kind, recommend that a similar committee be reappointed early next session to fully consider the subject referred to them.

HOUSE OF COMMONS OFFICIALS.

PROMOTION OF MR. A. C. CAMPBELL TO BE ASSOCIATE EDITOR AND APPOINTMENT OF MR. H. E. OLIVER TO DEBATES STAFF.

Sir ROBERT BORDEN moved, seconded by Sir George Foster, that the recommendation of His Honour the Speaker, laid on the table of the House on 6th February last, recommending the promotion of Mr. A. C. Campbell, of the Hansard staff, to be associate editor of the Official Debates, and of Mr. Harry E. Oliver, from the Committee Reporting Staff to the Official Debates Reporting Staff, be concurred in.

He said: I understand an explanation was given with regard to this matter on the 6th February.

Sir WILFRID LAURIER: I understand this recommendation is for the promotion of Mr. A. C. Campbell, of the Hansard staff to be associate editor. He is an officer of many years service and very competent.

Mr. LEMIEUX: I wish to add a word on behalf of Mr. Campbell. I think he is one of the most obliging men in the service, and I am glad to see that the Government has recognized his merit.

Motion agreed to.

THE WAR-TIME ELECTIONS ACT.

CONSIDERATION OF THE BILL IN COMMITTEE.

House in committee on Bill 133, The War-Time Elections Act, Mr. W. H. Bennett in the Chair.

On section 1—Part 1 of Dominion Elections Act suspended and part 2 to operate as amended:

Mr. A. K. MACLEAN: I suggest that we consider the Bill paragragh by paragraph. Section 1 occupies about 10 pages, and the matters referred to are not alike in character.

Mr. MEIGHEN: I do not see that there would be very much value in reading the whole section. We might consider it as much as possible in the order in which it appears. I know that it is impossible to confine the discussion to any particular clause of the Bill. We may take the discussion on the whole clause, but commence with the first part of it.

Sir WILFRID LAURIER: I desire to call attention to the words "complete demobilization" which appear in this Bill and in former Acts. That expression has never been given any legal definition. What is complete demobilization? Mobilization is simply calling the forces together, and demobilization will mean the time when, after peace is concluded, the order is given to recall the troops. Unless we have a definite definition, the period of demobilization may be extended to an unknown length.

Mr. MEIGHEN: I think demobilization has a distinct significance.

Sir WILFRID LAURIER: What is it?

Mr. MEIGHEN: I am not able to give it accurately, but my opinion of it is this: complete demobilization takes place when all those enlisted in the Canadian Expeditionary Forces are released from further obligations as members thereof.

Mr. MURPHY: I remind the Secretary of State that judicial decisions were given in England after the South African war defining the period of demobilization. I think they may have something to do with the names of the men being placed on the voters' lists.

Mr. MEIGHEN: Those decisions will apply here.

Mr. MURPHY: Perhaps my hon. friend could get information on the subject and give it to the committee.

Mr. MEIGHEN: I shall try to get it.

Mr. BUREAU: Do I understand that a definition is to be given of complete demobilization?

Mr. MEIGHEN: I do not think that a definition is necessary in the Act. I stated that I would ascertain what the legal significance of it was, as determined by British decisions, and that I would inform the committee. In the absence of any Canadian decisions the English decisions would be followed.

Mr. KNOWLES: Does this legislation apply to by-elections held after the general election?

Mr. MEIGHEN: If by-elections were held prior to demobilization, the provisions of this Bill would apply, because the Dominion Elections Act as it stands now applies to by-elections as well as to general elections. This Bill suspends the operation of certain clauses of the Dominion Elections Act and makes it read in a certain way until a certain time. Consequently, this Act, during the period of its operation, would apply to by-elections.

Mr. KNOWLES: In that case, having regard to the provisions of the Military Voters' Act, at every by-election every one of the thousands of men who are British subjects and who never lived in Canada would have a vote. A great deal of expense would be incurred in taking the votes of the soldiers overseas at every by-election.

Mr. MEIGHEN: The Military Voters' Act does not apply to by-elections. If it be decided to hold by-elections after the general election, some new provisions will have to be made, because we could not take the soldiers' votes in a by-election. I quite agree that the provisions of this Bill would be very awkward of application in such cases. It was not intended that this Act should apply to by-elections, but legally it would.

Mr. KNOWLES: No matter what party succeeds in the coming contest, by-elections will be necessary prior to the meeting of Parliament. Nearly always after an election some additional persons are called into the Government, or some defeated minister has to find a seat. The probability of this occurring within the next few months is more marked than it ever would be under normal conditions.

Mr. MEIGHEN: It is difficult enough to provide for a general election in war time; we hope to avoid the necessity of providing for a by-election. I can conceive of scarce-

ly anything more impracticable than to hold a by-election fairly in war time. It would be a tremendous task to pick out the soldiers who should vote in a particular constituency, to ascertain what relatives should vote in that district, and so on. I think the best way to avoid that would be not to have any ministers defeated.

Mr. MURPHY: You had better put that in the Bill.

Sir GEORGE FOSTER: That is not a bad idea.

Mr. KNOWLES: The law is that newly appointed ministers who formerly were ordinary members of Parliament must be re-elected. I suggest that it be provided that members of the Opposition who are elected and afterwards made ministers of the Crown shall not have to be re-elected.

Mr. A. K. MACLEAN: I call the attention of the committee to the fact that part 4 of the Military Voters' Act applies only in the event of a general election.

Mr. MARCIL: "The Dominion Elections Act" is the title of our present law. This Bill might well be styled "The War Time Dominion Elections Act."

Mr. PROULX: Does the Secretary of State not think it advisable to make this law applicable only to general elections?

Mr. MEIGHEN: I cannot say that that would be advisable. If by-elections are held, some law must be applicable—some law that will enable the vote to be recorded. However awkward the application of this Act might be, it would be better than the application of the other Act, which would be a downright outrage in a by-election. Before we are out of committee, I think consideration had better be given to the subject of by-election.

Mr. A. K. MACLEAN: Why not insert a provision stating that the law shall apply only to general elections?

Mr. MEIGHEN: I will give consideration to that. But the effect of that would be this: in one province I do not think a by-election could be held at all. If a by-election could be held in a given province, it would be on a different basis entirely from that on which a general election is held. However, I will see whether less trouble would be given by making the law apply to general elections only. That provision will be adopted which will create the less trouble and be the more equitable.

[Mr. Meighen.]

Mr. NESBITT: What is the affect of a and b in this section?

Mr. MEIGHEN: The effect—my words apply to similar clauses all through the Bill—is to make the list-making provisions now applicable in part 2 to Alberta and Saskatchewan, applicable generally throughout Canada.

Mr. KNOWLES: Is this part of the clause to be adopted? Surely that part which relates to demobilization cannot be adopted if the Government is going to give the matter consideration.

Mr. MEIGHEN: What I stated was that I would give the legal interpretation of the word as decided in the court. The paragraph stands so far as that is concerned.

Mr. KNOWLES: The Act should stand, not only for that purpose, but for the purpose of deciding whether you are going to make it effective after the general election is held or not, because that question is linked up with the other. The minister was to state whether or not this Act would cease to be effective at the close of the general election.

Mr. MEIGHEN: The paragraph will stand.

Mr. OLIVER: I have not the advantage of being a member of the legal profession, and, therefore, I am not as well able to dovetail this amending Act into the original Act as those who are of that profession. I find the greatest difficulty in arriving at an understanding of the provisions of this amending Act on account of having to do so much dovetailing with the original Act. Would it not have been possible to draw up this amending Act as a whole, that is to say, to make it complete in itself with such provisions as would be necessary in order to leave the original Act as it stands, but so that the citizen who was not a member of the legal profession could have some reasonable idea of the working and the effect of the new provisions? I am unable to follow intelligently the provisions of this new Bill.

Mr. NESBITT: That was my trouble.

Mr. MEIGHEN: The Bill will be printed as amended immediately Parliament decides how it should be amended. For the purpose of the committee now, I may say that the Bill will read in this way generally: The first four clauses of the old Act will remain as they are, that is, the sections before we come to Part I. The first section

defines the Act as the Dominion Elections Act. The second section gives the definitions and interpretations. The third section states that no one can be a candidate unless his consent is given. The fourth section requires the presence of agents. Those stand as they are. Then everything in Part I is struck out until we come to 32.

Mr. NESBITT: You are striking that out.

Mr. MEIGHEN: Yes, but we are substituting another section. When we come to section 32, we strike it out, for the reason that section 32 defines the old qualifications in Alberta and Saskatchewan. That is, the qualifications of voters fixed by the Dominion Parliament is applicable to those provinces. This Bill takes the provincial qualifications in those provinces exactly the same as in those other provinces. Consequently we take section 10, which was in Part I, and we substitute that for the old section 32. The present section 32 on the first page of the Bill is section 10 of the old Act.

Mr. A. K. MACLEAN: Will the Secretary of State secure a dozen or two dozen copies of the Act as amended for distribution?

Mr. MEIGHEN: I have just managed to get one compiled for myself. I show to the committee the size that it is.

Mr. BUREAU: Has the minister copies of the old Act as printed before, so that we can follow the amendments?

Mr. MEIGHEN: I had that done. I had a large number of copies of the old Act set up for distribution.

Sir GEORGE FOSTER: I cannot find them.

Mr. MEIGHEN: I do not know where they are. I thought hon. members had them.

Mr. PUGSLEY: When was that done?

Mr. MEIGHEN: Four days ago.

Mr. PUGSLEY: I was unable to get one.

Mr. OLIVER: I applied to the Printing Bureau on my own account, and I secured two copies.

Mr. MEIGHEN: I asked that copies be sent to the distribution office for the table of the House.

Mr. L. A. LAPOINTE: I sent for a copy of the Dominion Elections Act, and I received a copy of the Act before it was amended. This difficulty immediately arises. When one refers to the Dominion Act, one finds that there have been two or three amendments, so that it would take a Philadelphia lawyer to understand the whole thing.

Mr. MEIGHEN: Copies of the Dominion Elections Act, with all the amendments up to date, will be distributed.

Mr. L. A. LAPOINTE: An ordinary man would lose himself amongst all the amendments. For a man like myself it is very hard to understand the whole thing. I would suppose that a gentleman like the Secretary of State, with all his talents and capacity and with all the workers at his disposal, could have presented us with a Bill complete by itself without any reference to the old Act. In a few days more he could have given to the committee a complete Bill that hon. members and the general public could understand. I defy anybody to understand this measure. I have already heard the most talented lawyers complaining that they cannot understand one bit of it. Would it not be a good thing to adjourn this debate until the Government—and I refer in particular to the Solicitor General, with his talent—draw up a measure that the Government would understand?

Some hon. MEMBERS: Oh.

Mr. LAPOINTE: Hon. gentlemen opposite may laugh. I defy hon. gentlemen opposite, except possibly the Minister of Justice and the Solicitor General who may understand the Bill, to tell us what it means. They are at sea just as I am in regard to this legislation, but they will vote for it no matter whether they understand it or not. I beg the Government, and especially the Secretary of State, to frame a law so that the ordinary citizen of this country will understand it. Is this a trap? I want to find that out. I do not believe so; I believe the Secretary of State is honest in this respect, but the Government should not play with the people as they are doing by this piece of paper. By the first section the minister strikes out sections 1 to 31 of the Dominion Elections Act. Does any hon. member know if he has struck out enough or too much? Then after section 32 everything is upset, and the Secretary of State takes the precaution of saying: When we enact a section between sections 33 and 34, it is section 33A. I am in earnest in asking that a measure be framed so that the general public will be able to understand it,

and with the capacity of our hon. friends, that should be done in a day or two. In Quebec, when we amend an Act, we have to repeat the whole section that is amended. We do not only say that we strike out section 5 and replace it by section 4, but we repeat the whole section, and we put the new matter in brackets so that we know exactly where we stand. What I am asking for the people of this country, and especially for the people of my constituency, is that we should have a law that we can comprehend.

Mr. MEIGHEN: I would remind the hon. member for St. James that we are just at the commencement of the committee stage of this Bill. It is quite reasonable to expect that hon. gentlemen may not right at the very first understand the scheme of a proposed measure. But there is nothing new about it; this is the way in which we always amend Acts in this Parliament. It is true that there are more amendments necessary in this case than is usual, and that the old Act is very long itself and has been very frequently amended. Copies of the old Act are in the chief messenger's room and are being brought in for distribution. As the committee get to work on the Bill the difficulties will all disappear. It is not at all impossible that the committee may make several amendments, and as soon as the committee's work is done, not only the amending Act which we hope to pass, but the Bill as amended, will be printed and distributed to all of the members. In the meantime, I think the hon. member will thoroughly understand the Bill before we have been in committee on it for fifteen minutes.

Mr. PUGSLEY: I have gone carefully over the Bill and I quite agree with the Solicitor General that as discussion proceeds we shall begin to understand it more and more, and in the end it will no doubt be pretty clear to us. But the ordinary man reading this Bill finds it very difficult to understand.

Sir GEORGE FOSTER: What do you mean by the ordinary man?

Mr. PUGSLEY: I mean the elector, the returning officer, the agents for the candidate, and so on. I was going to make this suggestion: After the amendments are agreed upon, would it not be better by unanimous consent to substitute the completed Bill, giving the provisions of the present law as amended here, and let that pass as a complete Bill? Any one looking over the Bill and not studying it with very great care would certainly have difficulty in following its provisions; there is no question about that. I would also suggest to the Secretary of State whether or not in those provinces where the lists prepared by the provincial authorities are made the basis of the lists which the enumerators are to prepare, the enumerators could not be done away with. Women voters are to be added to the lists, of course. What has occurred to me, and I know it would be very convenient in my own province, is that all applications for names to be added should be made to the revisors, just as a person who is entitled to have his name on the voter's list would make application. It will be a new and a very strange thing in our province to have enumerators who can go about putting on and striking off names at pleasure, in secret, behind closed doors, and then, only ten days before polling day, post up the notices requiring those who have objections to make to come to the enumerator up to and even including the day of polling. The people of my province are not accustomed to that, and they will have great difficulty in reconciling themselves to the lists made by these enumerators. I would suggest that it would be very much better to take the existing provincial lists, and then make a simple provision for the addition of the women voters. That would be very easy, and I am sure it would be much more satisfactory to the people of the province of New Brunswick, at all events.

Mr. MEIGHEN: We are a long way from those clauses of the Bill as yet.

Mr. PUGSLEY: No, you are not, because the moment you strike out the heading, "Provinces of Saskatchewan and Alberta and Yukon Territory" you make the law applicable to the whole of Canada, which, of course, includes those provinces where they have the provincial lists.

Mr. MEIGHEN: I think this discussion would be more appropriate on the substituted clauses prescribing the methods by which this enumeration shall be made. However, as the subject is up, I know that the hon. member for St. John has made one important omission in his speech. He does not say before what tribunal, or by what machinery, these additional voters are to be put on the lists in his or any other province. It must be remembered that these votes are scattered over the length and

breadth of very large constituencies. The constituency of Halifax in Nova Scotia, for instance, is over seventy-five miles long.

Mr. PUGSLEY: Mine is twice as long as that.

Mr. MEIGHEN: We must have some means of getting these names on the lists. The hon. gentleman suggests that we have some short clausees in the Bill providing for it. That is just what we have. The quickest way to do it is to make it the business of somebody to get it done, and that is what we have done. It is true that a great many new names will have to added, but very few names in New Brunswick and Nova Scotia, for instance, will have to be struck off, and unless we make it somebody's business to look after the enrolling of these new names they will never get on in time. You cannot make it the business of judges to go over the length and breadth of these counties, if we are to have an election in reasonable time. The method has worked fairly well in the western provinces. There has been complaint that there were no safeguards for the Opposition, that the enumerators appointed by the Government in power had an advantage. But we have given safeguards here that are just as much to the advantage of one side as the other.

Mr. PUGSLEY: I have not been able to discover many safeguards.

Mr. MEIGHEN: I do not know of a more expeditious or simpler method of getting the additional votes that we have provided.

Mr. MARCIL: In the rural constituencies of the province of Quebec the lists are prepared by the secretary-treasurer for the municipality. He is the man who prepares the assessment roll and knows everybody in the municipality, and he acts under the control of the local municipal council. The lists are prepared by him and transmitted to the registrar of the county, and by him sent forward to the Clerk of the Crown in Chancery, and eventually they become the official lists. Speaking for my own constituency, of which I have more particular knowledge, I know that the minister will be unable to find in any parish or township a man better qualified to prepare these lists than the secretary-treasurer of the municipality. He has the advantage of having all the information he needs in his hands. There will be no question of politics in it, because in one municipality the secretary-treasurer might be a Conservative, and in the next a Liberal. I certainly think this officer would be the best man that could be got.

Mr. PUGSLEY: It is the same in the province of New Brunswick.

Mr. MEIGHEN: If you do that it simply means that you are making them enumerators.

Mr. MARCIL: Why not make them enumerators? They are the very best men you can get?

Mr. MEIGHEN: I am not so sure of that. If we use the machinery that is now in the provinces, the length of time that the Quebec law allows would lengthen out the whole contest. Furthermore, you have to have men who make it their business to understand this law. It is their peculiar business to find out who is entitled to vote under this law and then to put their names on the list. I do not know any reason why municipal officers would be the proper men in Quebec, when all along, ever since 1905, special officers have been appointed for the purpose in the provinces of Saskatchewan and Alberta. They have never used the secretary-treasurer of the municipalities there. Personally, I think the secretary-treasurers would resent very much having this made a part of their duties.

Mr. LEMIEUX: In the newer provinces we have, and shall have for a certain number of years, a shifting population. There are many residents of the United States who own large tracts of land in Canada. As was explained to me by an hon. friend from the West last night, municipal government in the West is as yet only in embryo.

My hon. friend from Bonaventure (Mr. Marcil) says we have an old settled population in the province of Quebec. That is perfectly true. Everybody knows everybody else. The municipal officer is a trusted official of the municipality; he acts on the school commission; he is clerk of the justices of the peace, and so on; he is secretary-treasurer of the municipality, and generally speaking he attends to all public functions in the municipality; he knows everybody; he knows the ropes, so to speak.

Mr. MEIGHEN: What would be the population of some of your larger municipalities?

Mr. LEMIEUX: The population varies; it would be anywhere from 300, 400, or 500 up to 1,000, or, perhaps, 1,500. I can assure my hon. friend that, if he will look into the matter he will find that the muni-

cipal officer is the best and most trusted officer in the municipality, and I daresay, for a small remuneration, better work could be got from him than if a stranger were brought in from the city, or if you were to appoint a lawyer from the shire town. I can assure my hon. friend that the municipal officer would give better satisfaction to the public. He knows every man, woman and child in the community, and if you avail yourself of his services I am satisfied you will find it much more convenient.

Mr. MEIGHEN: The size of the municipality, if nothing else, makes it impracticable.

Mr. LEMIEUX: What do you mean by that?

Mr. MEIGHEN: The population and the extent of the municipality. The scheme of this Act is that the work shall be done quickly by a large staff of officers who are paid a reasonable amount for their work. You cannot have it extended over a great length of time.

Mr. LEMIEUX: If my hon. friend will allow me, if you utilize the services of those municipal officers in the parishes and in the villages, and then have one enumerator for each constituency or each county, those municipal officers could report to the chief enumerator. But, to reach the people, to know the people and to enumerate them, no better means could be adopted than to avail ourselves of the services of these municipal officers.

Mr. MEIGHEN: My hon. friend has not quite seized the scheme yet. It would not do to have a municipal officer to take charge of all those in the municipality. An enumerator is responsible for a single polling division, and there must be one enumerator for each division, because he must sit at a certain place near the poll, for ten days before the voting, and he must sit at the poll or close to it on the polling day, so that if a man is not on the list he may go there and get a certificate to vote, or a certificate of refusal. It is true the lists compiled by these municipal officers will be used, and these lists are final as far as they go.

Mr. PUGSLEY: Are they final? As I read the Act the enumerator can strike off or add to the list according to his own judgment.

Mr. MEIGHEN: I think my hon. friend is wrong. The intention is that in Ontario, Quebec, New Brunswick, and Nova Scotia, the enumerator cannot touch the list except for two purposes—he can strike off but only for alienage, he can add to, but only for the female relatives of soldiers.

Mr. PUGSLEY: I do not so read it. If my hon. friend's statement is correct, it would be an improvement.

Mr. MEIGHEN: That is the intention, and if it is not clear in the Act it will be made clear.

Mr. OLIVER: While the provisions for compiling the voters' lists in the prairie provinces have been suitable and applicable to the conditions in those provinces, the reason is because there were peculiar conditions to be met, and the fact that the method adopted there was the best available method does not by any means settle the question that it is the best available method for other and entirely different conditions. The work of an enumerator in compiling the lists there was necessary because of what might be called the fluid character of the population, and the widely scattered settlements. It was the only way to arrive at any sort of knowledge as to who should or who should not vote. The method was not adopted because it was the best way to secure a sound and proper voters' list, and as a matter of fact it has not been found to be a good way where population is dense in the prairie provinces. It is not a good way in the cities, for instance. It is, however, the best method available in the scattered outlying rural settlements. While I am not sufficiently versed with conditions in this part of the country to criticise the Bill as applied to conditions here, I merely wish to point out for the information of the committee that the reason this system is used in the West is because of the peculiar conditions existing there, and not because the method is inherently or necessarily the best. I know of cases where an enumerator covers more than one polling division in the West, the reason being that the population is so very scattered that it would be unjust to include the total area in one poll, because it would be too far for the people to travel and at the same time it would not be worth while to appoint an enumerator for the small population voting at a single poll. Those are conditions peculiar to that country. Another point is that in regard to the actual casting of the vote, the fact that a man can swear his vote on, as we say, does not render the amendment of the list by the enumerator a serious matter there.

Mr. MEIGHEN: The feature that has existed of enabling one enumerator to act in more than one polling division in sparse populations is eliminated in this Bill. Otherwise, you could not carry out the provisions of the Bill. The enumerator must be there in order to make applicable the provisions of the Bill which we look upon as the safeguards. He has to be there to give a certificate, or to give a certificate of refusal, consequently, we have an enumerator for each poll.

Mr. OLIVER: I am only pointing out that when the Secretary of State instances the conditions in the West as a reason for the provisions of the Bill in the East, the reason is not adequate.

Mr. MEIGHEN: There is a lot of force in what my hon. friend from Edmonton says. The provisions as to enumerators are not as applicable to thickly settled districts and large cities as they are to less thickly settled districts. That is one of the reasons why this Act only puts Alberta and Saskatchewan on the same plane as British Columbia and Manitoba. There is no great difference in conditions between British Columbia and Alberta, and there is no great difference between Manitoba and Saskatchewan. When we come to the eastern provinces, however, where the population is more dense, and where there are larger cities, then we adopt the provincial lists that are here, and in the larger cities we provide for revision before we go to the poll, that is to say, we only partially adopt the enumeration system in those eastern provinces. Indeed, we only adopt it for the purposes of putting on the women who are now entitled and taking off the aliens who are disentitled.

Mr. McCRANEY: When I spoke the other day I suggested to the Government the desirability of making provision for registration in the cities of Saskatchewan. I confined it to my own province, but I have no doubt that it would be applicable to Alberta as well. In the city of Saskatoon, or Regina, or Moosejaw, or Prince Albert, there are many people moving about, commercial travellers and others, and it would be very difficult to pursue the system which is outlined in this Bill where votes may be challenged on election day, where the right of the voter to vote becomes the subject of investigation and where it will be necessary for the voter to hang around in continual readiness to prove his right to vote. On that account I suggest to the minister that it would be desirable to have registration under officers appointed by himself. Appeals can be taken and the lists will be completed in plenty of time before the election. I hope he will give that consideration.

Mr. A. K. MACLEAN: We are wandering over several clauses of this Bill, and I do not think we can make progress or discuss it in any intelligible way unless we take it up paragraph by paragraph. I suggest we take it up paragraph by paragraph and stick to it.

Mr. MEIGHEN: We are at paragraph 32.

Mr. NEELY: Upon this paragraph, 32, I would like to know if the Government cannot see their way clear, as the Secretary of State told us yesterday that this Bill was for the purpose of enlarging the scope of the franchise, to enlarge it a little further. The right hon. the Prime Minister (Sir Robert Borden) yesterday, in referring to the difficulty of extending the franchise to women generally spoke of matters of naturalization and some other things which should not stand in the way. There are things that could be easily obviated by designation as we do designate in paragraph 33 (a) certain things with regard to women relatives of men in the overseas force or who have been overseas. I would like to know if the Government have given this consideration and whether they are prepared to shut out from the franchise, in view of the recognition of the female relatives of men who are serving overseas, all the women in this country, say, of British birth and British origin, who have given all they were able to give, their time, their energy and their ability to war work. Surely a difficulty as to the naturalization might very fairly be overcome by designation. I would like to know if the Government will not consider enlarging the franchise in this regard.

Mr. MEIGHEN: This subject comes under paragraph 33 (a) rather than 32 but I might as well give my answer now as we have virtually passed 32. Thirty-two is really a clause of the old Act any way.

With reference to 33 (a), the Government has given very long, careful, if not prayerful thought to the subject that the hon. member for Humboldt (Mr. Neely) has brought to our attention. The difficulty in regard to naturalization is only one of the difficulties in the way. I noted with very great interest that, while the hon. member for Humboldt thought it could be got over by designation, he did not suggest any designation of those who should be included

and of those who should be left out. That was our difficulty too. If all were included that difficulty of naturalization would be insuperable.

Mr. NEELY: I did say British by birth.

Mr. MEIGHEN: The hon. member means to include all who are British by birth?

Mr. NEELY: And Canadian.

Mr. MEIGHEN: Then about three-fourths of the argument of yesterday directed against this whole question of discrimination would be levelled against us if we adopted that because that is discriminating against those who are British subjects now and have not the franchise while all the rest get it. The speech of the leader of the Opposition would reach us with direct force if we adopted that course. With naturalization on its present basis—and it cannot be altered very well now without an Imperial understanding—it is not just and right that those others naturalized should 4 p.m. be in a better position than those who are naturalized by personal application. That is one of our difficulties. The other difficulty which most distinctly applies to the suggestion of the hon. member for Humboldt that all other women of British birth be included is that if all of British birth are included then this franchise extended to the female relatives of soldiers loses its representative value altogether. It is nothing to the soldier if all women described in that way are included. It is making no quid pro quo to him because he in part loses his franchise and wholly loses his influence. Of the soldiers who have gone to the front 26,000 are dead and several thousand are prisoners of war. That is giving him nothing in lieu of what should be made up to him in a war-time election. Once you go as far as my hon. friend suggests, then the women's franchise loses its representative character and value altogether and the main necessity for the Bill is wiped away. I know of no way else to draw the line which will at the same time meet the difficulty as to naturalization, and, on the other hand, and more important in my estimation, make the women's vote representative of the soldiers overseas.

Mr. McCRANEY: I appreciate the point of the Solicitor General in desiring to make up during the next election for the loss of the influence which those overseas would have if they were here by giving their relatives the franchise which, to some extent, might compensate them for that. While this has been mentioned before, it is put forward so prominently now by the minister that it strikes me that this feature is not a feature in the enfranchisement of women. It is doubling the franchise of men. It is not put forward as a measure of suffrage to women because they are women. It is multiplying the influence of men and it is put forward on that ground.

Mr. MEIGHEN: Not multiplying—just keeping up the regular standard.

Mr. McCRANEY: It is very irregular, because the female vote may be from one to half a dozen in case of some soldiers. I am not complaining about it. I am only showing the character of it. Perhaps it is not always possible to be consistent. The Government does not profess to be consistent on all occasions, and I do not know why members on this side of the House should be expected to be. I would not ask the Government, in the view which they hold, to extend the franchise to the women of the country on the same terms as it is extended to men. My chief objection to this Bill is the fact that some will be disfranchised who now have a vote. Perhaps we would not enfranchise some of them, if we were starting de novo. But I feel that there is a great body of earnest women in this country whose sentiments are loyal, and who are showing those sentiments by the work they are doing. If the suggestion of my hon. friend from Humboldt (Mr. Neely) has made, that women who are British subjects be enfranchised were adopted, it would go a long way. It would not enfranchise those women who have become British subjects by operation of law, and, perhaps, in declining to enfranchise them my hon. friend has in mind the wives of the men whom he proposes to disfranchise, and probably he objects to their becoming enfranchised.

Mr. MEIGHEN: I want the hon. gentleman to understand that the wives, sisters, daughters, and mothers of that class who may be overseas are enfranchised by this Bill, just the same as any other.

Mr. McCRANEY: But the Prime Minister's statement is that that class are not accepted as recruits, and if they become soldiers they must represent themselves as Russians, or some other nationality.

Sir ROBERT BORDEN: My hon. friend does not draw one distinction which he ought to draw. I was not speaking of wo-

men of any nationality. In the observations which I made yesterday in regard to naturalization I was speaking of women who were not British subjects by birth.

Mr. McCRANEY: I quite understand the statement of the Prime Minister in reference to that, but I am assuming—and no doubt the minister will correct me if I am wrong—that the reason women who are naturalized by operation of law, through the fact of their husbands being naturalized, are not included in the franchise, is because the Government realized that it would enfranchise that large body of women who are wives of the foreign class which they propose to disfranchise.

Mr. MEIGHEN: This Bill affects the alien enemy foreigner, but to enfranchise women generally would enfranchise the wives, sisters and all the other relatives of men born in other countries, not alien enemy at all, not speaking the alien enemy language, but speaking Norwegian or Russian, and people from all the countries of the world. It deals with a very much wider class.

Mr. McCRANEY: If the measure enfranchised the wives of all British-born subjects, I would be satisfied if it enfranchised, in addition to those, the wives of all who came from other than alien enemy countries. It strikes me the reason the Government is confining the franchise as it does is because it fears to enfranchise the wives of the men whom they are disfranchising.

Mr. MEIGHEN: Well, in part. But the hon. gentleman will follow me in two small steps of reasoning: in the first place, had we taken that course, and enfranchised the British born, and the British born alone, then the argument advanced by the leader of the Opposition, that persons resident in Canada, naturalized—and consequently given this pact as he describes it, if it is a pact—are discriminated against, would come with crushing force on us. That is the argument the hon. gentleman is advancing now. He could not endorse the position taken by the hon. leader of the Opposition yesterday, and stand where he is to-day. The second point—and in my judgment a much more important point—is that to enfranchise all the British-born women of Canada would be no remuneration to the soldiers overseas for what they are denied by virtue of a war election. There would be no compensation for them in that, and the Bill would lose its main purpose, and, indeed, its main justification. I think the hon. member for Saskatoon will see that this is impracticable. How can we go through an election, and say to those overseas: "Those who stay at home can use their influence, canvass, go from door to door, make their appeals, and all the weaker passions of our nature can be played upon by the demagogue and everyone else, but you men overseas, who have other motives and principles, cannot do so, and we will hold an election while you are 4,000 miles away, and deny you the right to exercise any personal influence whatever, and will also deny you 50 per cent of your vote." That is the condition we are endeavouring to repair. But if you give all the British-born a vote, you do not repair that condition in any sense at all. In peace times, it would be justified, but if you give it now, you deny to the soldiers overseas that influence which it is the purpose of this Bill to give.

Mr. McCRANEY: My hon. friend is emphasizing that point very much. I am quite satisfied that if the women of the city in which I live who are British subjects by birth were enfranchised, they would support the soldiers at the front.

Mr. PUGSLEY: Hear, hear.

Mr. McCRANEY: The Solicitor General is assuming that they would be antagonistic. I am putting forward this argument, because day after day the women are going to the Red Cross room, and carrying on such activities, and I would like, without laying myself open to charges of inconsistency, to try and work out something practicable, so that these women, other than those entitled to vote because of ties of relationship, shall have some say, and shall be able to exercise their influence in the same direction as those who have ties with the soldier.

Mr. PUGSLEY: I do not think the Solicitor General puts the ground for giving the right of voting to the relatives of the soldiers upon the right basis. I do not think it is intended to give to the relatives of the soldiers the right to vote in order that they may represent the soldiers, but the vote is to be given to the women because of the sacrifices they have made, by reason of their relationship.

Mr. MEIGHEN: Both reasons.

Mr. PUGSLEY: It seems to me the latter is the true reason—that they have made the very greatest sacrifice a woman

can make in parting with those dear to them; I think that it is the true ground upon which the argument should be based. If I were a soldier I would rather trust the ordinary women of the country than my own relatives to see that I was treated fairly in everything. The ordinary women of the country would not be interested especially through ties of blood; they would be interested as citizens, as women of Canada; and I am satisfied that they could be relied upon to see that absolute justice was done to soldiers in the matter of their support at the front and of proper provision for them on their return. In the matter of allowances to their relatives, in the matter of separation allowance, in the matter of pensions, do you not think that the ordinary woman would be even more generous in her demands than the relative of the soldier would be? It seems to me that the Secretary of State does not present any argument against the extension of the franchise to those persons whom the member for Montreal, St. Lawrence, Mr. Bickerdike) called the loyal and patriotic women of Canada.

The Prime Minister makes objection to extending the franchise to women generally on the ground that conditions affecting the naturalization laws have to be considered. Surely that difficulty, if it is a difficulty, must have presented itself to the Prime Minister two or three months ago when he assured the women's delegations who waited upon him that the franchise would be extended generally to the women of the country. On the 16th of May last, the following resolution was moved by the member for South Oxford (Mr. Sutherland):

That, in the opinion of this House, the question of extending the franchise to women should engage the attention of the Government at the present session.

That resolution was received sympathetically by the Prime Minister; he gave the women of the country to understand that the Government would act upon it. During the course of the discussion I moved the following amendment:

That all the words after the word "That" be struck out and the following substituted therefor:

"the Dominion Election Act should be so amended at the present session as to make uniform the right of women to vote for members of the House of Commons in those provinces which have granted to them the provincial franchise."

That amendment was ruled out of order by the Speaker. He said:

The member has on the Order Paper a resolution No. 6, following this one, which it seems to me, although it is not in the same terms, is substantially the same as the one which he now submits by way of amendment. Bourinot says, page 301, "Nor is it regular to move as an amendment to a question a motion of which notice has been given and which appears in its place on the notice paper."

The question being again proposed on the amendment, the Prime Minister moved the following amendment to the motion of the member for South Oxford:

That all the words after the word "That" be struck out and the following substituted therefor:

"in the opinion of this House the question of extending the franchise to women should engage the attention of Parliament before an appeal to the people is made."

And the question being proposed on the amendment, I moved an amendment to the amendment in the following words:

That the following words be added thereto: "and it is therefore desirable that a measure having this object in view should be submitted to Parliament by the Government during the present session."

A debate arose upon that, and on the motion of the member for Russell (Mr. Murphy) the debate was adjourned. On a number of occasions since then I have been assured by gentlemen leading the House that an opportunity would be given for the discussion of this motion, of the amendment moved by the Prime Minister and of the amendment to the amendment moved by myself. But the important thing is that my right hon. friend moved as an amendment that the matter of extending the franchise to women should engage the attention of Parliament before an appeal to the people was made. That was an assurance to the House and to the women of the country that the Government was favourable to extending the franchise generally to the women of Canada. There is no doubt about that; the women of Canada so understood it; they expressed themselves as thankful to the Government for having at last decided to ask Parliament to grant them equal rights of suffrage. My right hon. friend put forth objections of a fanciful character as an explanation why the right of suffrage is granted to a few—I admit that it should be granted to them; they have strong claims to it—and is refused to hundreds of thousands of other women who are equally entitled to it. No harm can come from extending the franchise generally to the women of Canada; I am satisfied that every possible good would come from it. The Government ought not to let this session pass, it ought not allow this Bill to be disposed of, with-

out making provision for extending the franchise to women generally. If there are any objections on the ground of nationality or naturalization, then let the franchise be limited to the British-born women of Canada. That would extend the franchise to several hundred thousand women who, as I said yesterday, have shown during this war, by the unceasing work which they have done and the splendid patriotism which they have evidenced, that they are as capable of exercising the franchise as the men. They have shown that they are just as much concerned in the good government of this country and in the welfare of this Dominion as the men who exercise the franchise to-day. I was much struck by the remark of a lady who was very much in favour of suffrage and who spoke many times on the subject in the western provinces. Somebody suggested that the women might make a mess of politics. Well, she said, a much worse mess could not be made of it than is being made to-day; the women could not do very much worse than the men. That is true. The men do it as well as they can, but I am satisfied that the women, if they were given the right to vote, would in many cases do very much better than the men. No good reason can be urged against giving the women the right of the franchise. I appeal to the hon. gentleman who introduced the resolution to which I have referred to repeat the arguments which he presented on that occasion. The women of this country are waiting to receive a message that the Government will carry out their pledge. My right hon. friend says that some of the women, recognizing that the Government have gone quite a distance, believe that the Government ought to receive the thanks of the women. That may be so, but these women have been deceived; they have been led to believe that this is simply a War-time Elections Act, the effect of which will end when the war is over. That is not true. It is nowhere provided by legislation that there is to be a new general election when this war is over. But the men, whether they will be Liberals or Conservatives, who will be elected under this proposed franchise, will be the representatives of the people and will have charge of the administration of affairs for the next five years. Supposing this war should end in a year, they will be in charge for four years after it is over. I am satisfied that, when the women of this country realize that they are to be debarred from the exercise of the franchise, of having any control over the affairs of this country during the next five years, my right hon. friend will hear from them in very loud tones. I am told that even to-day my right hon. friend has been requested to receive delegations in order to hear their representations. I have been given this telegram from Vancouver, dated the 8th of September:

> Have wired Premier following United Suffrage Societies' protest against Election Act now before House re woman suffrage which disfranchises women of British Columbia. Object to any extension of franchises to women except on same terms as to men. Demand federal franchise for women who are qualified as men are qualified.
>
> (Sgd.) United Suffrage Societies.

I am told that is a very large, representative, influential organization, having its headquarters in Vancouver, and I am satisfied they represent the feeling of the women throughout this country. They have been demanding the franchise; they have been led to expect that they will receive the franchise, and as I have said, at last they thought they had the absolute promise of my right hon. friend that the franchise would be given to them. The attitude of my right hon. friend at first—some two or three years ago when a delegation of women waited upon him, was that it was a matter for the provincial legislatures to deal with. He led the women of this country to believe that whenever the provincial legislatures extended to women the right of suffrage, ipso facto, they would have the right to vote for members of this Parliament. Five provinces of Canada have given to women the right of suffrage. Under the assurance that was then given by the Prime Minister, they had a right to suppose that, at all events as to those provinces, the right of suffrage in voting for members for this Parliament would be extended to them. When the matter came up in the House, the Prime Minister hesitated to ask Parliament to enact legislation which would carry out that view. I remember, either one or two sessions ago, when I introduced a resolution expressly providing for that, feeling sure that I would have the hearty support of the Prime Minister, he called upon his supporters to vote down the resolution, and, in consequence, it was defeated. During this session, my right hon. friend has led the women of this country to believe—at least so I am informed, because I was not present at the meeting, but the matter was reported in the press—that a general right of suffrage would be granted to them. Certainly, his attitude in this House when he

moved the amendment to the resolution of the hon. member for South Oxford (Mr. Sutherland) that the question of extending the franchise to the women should engage the attention of Parliament before dissolution, was one that was calculated to lead Parliament and the people of the country to believe that a general measure of franchise would be submitted to Parliament at the present session.

Sir ROBERT BORDEN: My hon. friend apparently forgets that, when he proposed a motion at the present session—the motion to which he has just now alluded—he phrased it in this way:

> In the opinion of this House it is desirable that provision be made either to grant to women who are qualified to vote for members of a Provincial Legislature, the right also to vote for members of the Dominion Parliament, or to grant to women throughout the Dominion the right to vote for members of Parliament, subject to such provisions and limitations as may seem reasonable to Parliament.

Mr. PUGSLEY: Hear, hear.

Sir ROBERT BORDEN: The proposal of my hon. friend in the first instance, made one or two sessions ago, was that we should enact in this Parliament legislation making it possible for women who had the right of provincial franchise to exercise that right of franchise in federal elections. A good deal has been said about discrimination. I imagine that the women of Canada, in the provinces in which they have not hitherto received the franchise in provincial elections, would look upon that as a very grave discrimination if the Government should carry it out. But I pointed out also to my hon. friend—although he speaks lightly of the question of naturalization to which I alluded yesterday—that, in the terms of the motion I have just read, he himself recognized the importance of certain provisions and limitations which might seem reasonable to Parliament. I do not wish to repeat what I said yesterday on this point. I endeavoured to make myself perfectly clear, and I hope I did so. My hon. friend now suggests—along the principle of his motion of two years ago, but entirely in opposition to the view put forward by his leader yesterday—that we should amend the provisions of this Bill by providing that women of British birth should have the franchise and that women born in other countries, who were not of British nationality, should not have that right. The leader of the Opposition urged, with all the force at his command, that the provisions of this measure would prevent people from coming to this country as immigrants. What my hon. friend is urging just now would be a very much wider example of discrimination. Women who came to this country from the United Staes of America, or who came from France and other Allied nations, would be discriminated against by the proposal of my hon. friend. The observations of the leader of the Opposition would have very much greater force if directed against the hon. member for St. John than they had when directed against the proposal embodied in this Bill.

I realize at once that there are in this country many women who, under the provisions of this Bill, will not have the vote at the coming election. I realize fully also, that at least a great majority of the women have worked untiringly and devotedly in aid of the purpose of Canada in this war. So far as these observations of my hon. friend are concerned, I entirely concur in the appreciation he has expressed. But we have to deal with conditions as they are in this country to-day. We have to deal with the situation which I described in my remarks of yesterday. I adhere entirely to the opinion that I have already expressed more than once in this House, namely, that the women of Canada generally are entitled to the franchise, and if the people of this country should give to me a mandate at the next general election, I undertake to carry out the purpose that I have already proclaimed. I propose to carry that out according to those lines and subject to the observations which I made on this point yesterday. Therefore, so far as that general principle is concerned, there will be no departure from it so far as my action may control it. But we are dealing now with an election in time of war. We are dealing with this question at a time when the life of Parliament will expire in less than four weeks. We are dealing with it under conditions of an unusual character in many ways. When we come to consider the question of naturalization, we have to take into account that it has been the purpose of the statesmen of all the self-governing nations of the British Empire to have one uniform system of naturalization, and that the naturalization so established shall be effective throughout the Empire and not, as previously established, effective only in the Dominion or in the nation where the naturalization was granted. So when we come to look at it in the aspect which commends itself to my mind, we find ourselves confronted with this situa-

tion: The women of this country, if they are entitled to the franchise, are entitled also to determine their citizenship. I do not think any hon. gentleman in this House or any man or woman in this country would gainsay that. If a woman is entitled to her full voice in the affairs of this country, then that woman is entitled to determine her citizenship for herself, and not to have it determined for her by the mere fact of her marriage. But in order to bring that about, and to remove the anomalies which the present system creates, it will be necessary to pass legislation which will have to be very carefully considered, and as to which there ought to be negotiations with the Mother Country and with the other self-governing dominions of the Empire if we are to preserve the uniformity which at the conference of 1911 was regarded as essential, and if we are to preserve one type and form of naturalization for the whole British Empire. I am sure every one in this country will realize the absolute impossibility of accomplishing all that between now and the 7th of October, when the life of this Parliament expires.

My hon. friend (Mr. Pugsley) reproaches me because he considers I have not given sufficient attention to the subject during the past six or seven weeks. I would point out to him that we have had half a dozen matters engaging the attention of the Government during this season, any one of which under ordinary conditions would have been regarded as a sufficient undertaking for a government during one whole session of Parliament. We have had to grapple with these questions as best we could, and it may be possible that owing to those circumstances, and not to any indisposition on my part, adequate attention has not been given to the particular feature which I brought to the notice of the House yesterday. That has been our misfortune, and not our fault. At all events, we are dealing with conditions as they are now, and I say once more: it would be impossible for this Parliament in the limited time which will elapse between now and the 7th of October to give to that question the consideration and the attention which it deserves, and, more than that, to have the communication with the Government and Parliament of the Mother Country and of the Overseas Dominions which would be necessary if we are to preserve the essential feature of uniformity in naturalization throughout the Empire which was laid down as a guiding principle at the conference of 1911, and which was carried out so far as the Mother Country and some of the Dominions are concerned, by the legislation enacted in 1914.

I realize fully that there may be women in this country—there doubtless are—who will not be entitled to the franchise under this Bill and who may feel aggrieved about it. But I am also convinced that when they come to realize and comprehend the situation which confronts the Government at this time, they will give the Government credit for dealing with the question in a fair and reasonable way, and for doing what they could to give the franchise to a very large body of Canadian womanhood—and this Bill will undoubtedly grant the franchise to a very large number of the women of this country. I know that there are those who have worked unceasingly and devotedly who have not immediate relatives at the front, but who are as earnest in their purpose and in their endeavour as any woman in Canada could be. I hope and believe they will understand and comprehend this situation.

As far as we are concerned, I repeat once more that we have endeavoured to frame this Bill on the guiding principle of service and of sacrifice. While I give every credit that could be given to those devoted women in Canada who have not relatives at the front, but who nevertheless have thrown their whole heart and soul into the national purpose, yet it must be conceded, even by these women themselves, that those women have made the greater sacrifice who have sent to the front those who are nearest and dearest to them to fight for our institutions, for our liberties, and for the preservation of this Empire.

Mr. NEELY: We all recognize that in giving this Bill its second reading Parliament was recognizing the principle of discrimination so far as the franchise is concerned. The Government recognized that the Bill was open to criticism from the fact that in extending the franchise to women they had to draw a line somewhere. The Prime Minister had just admitted that injury may be done to many of the women of Canada who have given splendid service since the outbreak of the war, and who will not be enfranchised by this Bill. I presume that in the matter of disfranchising the electors the same holds good, and that the Government are not satisfied with the degree of disfranchisement this Bill proposes. They would go further if they could, or if they dared; but they have gone as far

as they can find reasonable excuse for going.

This Bill recognizes the principle of discrimination in the granting of the franchise, but there is this underlying principle as I understand it: the Government, while discriminating along certain lines for the benefit and safety of the state, as they tell us, still wish to depart as little as possible from the underlying principle of the Dominion franchise, namely, the recognition for federal purposes of the provincial standards of qualification. If that is the intent of the Government, if they wish to preserve that principle in the legislation now before us, as well as by their discrimination to safeguard the interests of the state, I should suggest the following amendment, which I hope the Government will see their way clear to adopt:

That at the end of line 16, page 1 of the Bill, after the word "male" there be added the words "or female," and that the same words be added after the word "male" in line 20 of the same section.

The section would then read:

The qualifications necessary to enable any male or female person to vote at a Dominion election in any province shall, except as by this Act otherwise provided, be those established by the laws of that province as necessary to entitle any male or female person to vote in the same part of the province at a provincial election.

The Government have already admitted that they are granting the franchise to certain classes of women upon certain grounds, namely, that the soldier overseas may have a representative not only to vote for him in this country, but also to exert the influence he probably would have on the sentiments of his relatives and friends at an election if he were here in person.

Mr. MARCIL. What about trying to get half a dozen women to agree upon a question?

Mr. NEELY: I do not know about that. Is there not an insinuation in the position taken by the Secretary of State that the only women in this country who can be trusted to multiply or increase the influence of the soldier overseas in an election are his own immediate relatives. I think this Bill puts an imputation, on a percentage of the women of this country, which is absolutely unworthy of this Parliament. While I know that the eliminating effect of this Bill, so far as the franchise is concerned, does not go as far as the Government would like, is there any justification or any reason why in provinces where women's franchise has already been adopted, and the principle is accepted, where we are by this very Bill trusting the men to vote, we should not also trust these men's wives? I quite understand that the proposal of the Government is to disfranchise certain of our male electors, and presumably they will not trust the wives or daughters of these male electors at this forthcoming election, but is there any reason why in those provinces where women's franchise has already been granted, the wives and daughters of electors who have not been disfranchised should not have the right to vote? That is standing by the underlying principle of the present Dominion franchise, namely, that in so far as possible we adopt the provincial standard of qualification, and it is the Government's intention and hope, they would have us believe, that they are trying to depart from that principle just as little as possible in the present Bill. That obviates all the difficulties the Prime Minister was speaking about. Stick by the provincial franchise and provincial standard of qualification, except in so far as the Government is determined to disfranchise a certain class of the electors. That, of course, we presume will naturally tell against the wives and the daughters of those electors as well as against the men themselves. I think it is a sound principle to adopt the provincial franchise, and as far as we adopt the provincial franchise if we trust the male elector to retain his franchise, we should also trust his wife and daughter.

Mr. MEIGHEN: The hon. gentleman intimates something about my not trusting any woman except those who have sons overseas. That is not the point at all. If is not a question of trusting the women of Canada to stand by the war. There are differences of opinion as to how practically to stand by our boys and by the war, and in the judgment of the Government those who would most likely share the opinions of the men overseas as to the best method and the only method of doing so would be their near relatives. It is not unreasonable to presume that the sentiments of the overseas force would be best reflected by Canada in their own immediate relatives. I do not think that is illogical or unreasonable. That is as far as I have gone, and that is as far as I need go to justify the measure. The amendment moved by my hon. friend looks to the adoption throughout Canada of the provincial franchise. If it is passed, then wherever or whosoever she be, a woman

who can vote in any province can vote in the Dominion elections. Let us get the full meaning of this, so that the House may understand it, and with this in view, I think it is just as well that the amendment has been moved. In the four western provinces all naturalized British subjects, no matter how they are naturalized, get the vote. If a woman comes from Germany, or Austria, and marries three weeks after she arrives, she becomes naturalized, and is entitled to the vote.

Mr. NESBITT: Not according to the other provisions.

Mr. MEIGHEN: Not according to the other provisions, because they are in direct conflict with this. The other provisions are in accord with section 32 as it stands, but you cannot change paragraph 32 if the other provision stands. The contention of the hon. member for Humboldt (Mr. Neely) is that we shall adopt the provincial franchise as to women. Let hon. gentlemen understand what the effect of that would be. If a woman who has been a week in Canada marries a naturalized citizen, she thereby becomes a naturalized British subject. That is the law of the land to-day.

Mr. NEELY: She would not be entitled to vote.

Mr. MEIGHEN: She would be entitled to vote immediately she had the residence required by the province.

Mr. PUGSLEY: Does not the minister see that by this paragraph the qualifications necessary to enable any male or female person to vote at a Dominion election in any province shall, except as by this Act otherwise provided, be those established by the laws of that province. Could it not be easily worked out in some other sections?

Mr. MEIGHEN: If this passes who would be able to vote, and who would not?

Mr. PUGSLEY: If my hon. friend thinks it desirable to disqualify men of alien enemy origin, I presume he would also disqualify the wives of men of alien enemy origin. That could be easily done because if the majority of the House determines that those men should be disfranchised, naturally their wives would also be disfranchised.

Mr. MEIGHEN: I would like to get the intention of the hon. member for Humboldt. Is it his intention by the amendment that there would be disfranchisement of the wives of Germans, Austrians, Turks, and Bulgarians, naturalized within the last fifteen years?

Mr. NEELY: Most assuredly. I said we should recognize the principle of discrimination; you would have to do so.

Mr. MEIGHEN: That would not be the effect of the amendment if it passed although of course, other clauses could be changed accordingly to bring about that effect. In so far as the alien enemy born are concerned, any one of them naturalized within the last fifteen years would not be able to vote, whether male or female, but in so far as Swedish born are concerned, a woman would be a naturalized British subject the moment she landed in Canada if she then married, and as soon she acquired her residence in the province, whatever it might be—it is one year—she would be entitled to vote. Is it the intention of the hon. member for Humboldt that the man should be required to be here three or five years, before he could become a naturalized citizen and have the right to vote, and that the woman could get that right in one year?

Mr. NEELY: She will only have the right to vote and come under the operation of the franchise if she marries a British subject. So far as I am personally concerned, I would say in answer to the Secretary of State, that I would be perfectly willing to trust with the franchise a Swedish woman married to a British subject for one year, in war time or any other time.

Mr. MEIGHEN: A naturalized British subject?

Mr. NEELY: Yes.

Mr. MEIGHEN: That would make her a British subject. Of course, if she was born in Germany, she would have to be here three years and the man would have to be here five years, but a Swedish woman who marries a naturalized British subject of German origin, after one year's residence, is entitled to a vote. Would the hon. gentleman support that legislation?

Mr. NEELY: That is a side issue. Cases of that kind would be exceedingly few.

Mr. MEIGHEN: There are thousands of them.

Mr. NEELY: As we are discriminating we can very easily provide for cases where women marry British subjects of alien enemy birth. If you are taking the franchise away from a man of alien enemy birth it is a simple thing to say that his wife shall not have it.

Mr. MEIGHEN: If she marries a British subject of alien enemy birth, she will not be entitled to the franchise?

Mr. NEELY: She will not.

Mr. MEIGHEN: If she marries a British subject who was not of alien enemy birth she will?

Mr. NEELY: Certainly.

Mr. MEIGHEN: Is not that discriminating against a British subject of alien enemy birth? Is that not exactly what we were warned against yesterday by the hon. gentleman's leaders?

Mr. NEELY: I am not trying to be consistent because I recognize that the whole Bill is a mass of inconsistencies. We are recognizing the principle of discrimination all through this Bill. We are passing this special Act to get away from the usual Dominion Franchise Act and to do that by a process of discrimination. My point is this: Keeping, as we hope to do, as near to the provincial franchise as possible, where a man has a vote his wife should have a vote also.

Mr. NESBITT: The Secretary of State has given as an illustration the case of a Swedish woman who came here and married a naturalized British subject who, under this Act, would have had to be here since 1902. We take it for granted that he would be a proper British subject if he had been here during that time. I would be perfectly willing to give that woman a vote. I have no dread of that sort of a voter. I have no such dread of the naturalized
5 p.m. alien as my hon. friend has.

Mr. MEIGHEN: Why not give the same right to the man?

Mr. NESBITT: Why not? I cannot see why not.

Mr. MEIGHEN: If a woman was a naturalized British subject and a Swede came to Canada and married her next day would my hon. friend be prepared to give that man a vote?

Mr. NESBITT: If the Swede were here a year and if he had become a British subject I would give him a vote.

Mr. MEIGHEN: A naturalized German woman who has been here since 1902 is entitled to a vote. A Swedish man comes here and marries her the next day after he arrives. Would the hon. gentleman give that man a vote?

Mr. NESBITT: No, not the next day.

[Mr. Neely.]

Mr. MEIGHEN: That is what he wants to give the woman.

Mr. NESBITT: He would have to wait a year.

Mr. MEIGHEN: He would have to wait a year by the law of the province but he would be a British subject next day after his arrival. My hon. friend would give him a vote after a year's residence in Canada?

Mr. NESBITT: Sure I would. I do not object to giving these men votes. There are lots of men up in my constituency who will be disqualified and who are just as loyal and just as good citizens as the Secretary of State is.

Mr. MEIGHEN: I only want to know what the hon. gentleman intends. If he intends that, all right.

Mr. NESBITT: Sure; that is what I intend. I would not cut them out. My hon. friend here (Mr. Neely) has moved a resolution which I am going to second and which follows the provincial law. The provincial Act does not say that if they are here a month or a day they shall be naturalized as British subjects. My hon. friend knows that.

Mr. MEIGHEN: Yes, they can become British subjects in a day.

Mr. NESBITT: No.

Mr. MEIGHEN: They would not have a vote in a day but they would be naturalized.

Mr. NESBITT: What is the use of splitting hairs in that way? The hon. gentleman, the House, and the country know what I mean. I am not a bit alarmed about these aliens. I have aliens in my constituency, many of whom are serving in the war, who are just as loyal as the Secretary of State is or any gentleman on the other side of the House.

Mr. DEVLIN: We have in that riding a respectable body of Indians, several of whom have enlisted and have gone overseas. Will the squaws in that case have a right to vote?

Mr. MEIGHEN: Not under the Bill as it stands, for this reason, that the Bill requires women to qualify as to age, race, and residence in accordance with the laws of the provinces, and under the laws of the provinces the Indian race has not a vote.

Sir WILFRID LAURIER: My hon. friend the Secretary of State yesterday took credit

for having granted the franchise to a new class of voters, to the women who are relatives in near degree of the men who have enlisted. So far so good; nobody quarrels with that. But my hon. friend, while actuated by this praiseworthy motive, cannot conceal the fact that he is taking away the franchise from many female subjects of His Majesty who ought to have it if the law were properly carried out. I understand that my hon. friend proposes to maintain the principle of the provincial franchise in this Bill; and wants to depart as little as possible from the laws that exist to-day except that he proposes to extend the franchise to the female relatives of the men at the front, and that he is taking it away from voters of alien origin. As the law exists to-day in five provinces, women have the franchise. We had this discussion yesterday, but we are now considering the framing of this measure, and it is perhaps as well that we should have a little more discussion on it. Section 6 of the Dominion Elections Act, which we are now amending, reads:

> For the purposes of any Dominion election held within the limits of a province, the voters' lists shall, except as herein otherwise provided, be those prepared for the several polling divisions established, and which, on the sixtieth day next preceding the day fixed for the nomination of candidates for such Dominion election, were in force, or were last in force, under the laws of that province, for the purposes of provincial elections.

Mark the words with which this section begins: For the purposes of any Dominion election held within the limits of a province, the voters' lists shall, except as herein otherwise provided, be the voters' lists for a Dominion election. My hon. friend told us yesterday what is well known to be a fact, that in Manitoba and British Columbia the lists which are now in existence have the names of female voters upon them.

I would think that, if a Dominion election were held under the Act as it stands, these men and women who are on the list in Manitoba and British Columbia would have a right to vote. The Secretary of State shakes his head. Yesterday we were told that the law officers of the Crown, the Minister of Justice, the Solicitor General, and the Deputy Minister of Justice, were of opinion this this Bill did not give the franchise to women. Of course, every man has his own way of interpreting the law. I may be right in my view, or the interpretation placed upon the Bill by the law officers of the Crown may be the correct one, but we have to accept the opinion expressed by the law officers of the Crown. I should like to have a judicial interpretation, but that is not possible. In my view, the language is as plain as plain can be. I think that the lists have to be taken as they are, and that the provincial franchise in any province is the one upon which the law is to be administered, and under which the Dominion elections are to be held. The minister told us yesterday that section 6 did not apply to women. I do not understand why it should not apply. If the law of the province makes a person an elector, and that elector has the right to vote in a provincial election, I cannot understand why he should not also have the right to vote at a Dominion election. There is no question in such a case, if it be a male voter, that he has the right to vote at a Dominion election, but it is said that a female voter has not the same right and I cannot understand why. The law officers of the Crown have decided otherwise, and we must abide by their decision. If the law to-day is that women in the five provinces of Ontario, Saskatchewan, Alberta, Manitoba, and British Columbia have the right to vote at provincial elections, there is one thing certain, namely, that these women expect to have the right to vote at Dominion elections, and they will all claim it. My hon. friend (Mr. Pugsley) states that the Premier has been deluged with telegrams from women protesting against being excluded from the operation of this Bill, and if section 6 of the Dominion Elections Act is not sufficient to cover the point, and grant the right of suffrage to these women who have had it in the five provinces, why should it not be provided that they should have it? My hon. friend has rather played upon words, in his answer to the hon. member for Humboldt a moment ago. He puts the case of a Swedish woman marrying an alien, and he stated that she would not have the right to vote. That is a very nice point. These women would have to choose between the husband on one side, and suffrage on the other. A woman would have to decide whether she would rather have a husband and no vote, or a vote and no husband. What reason can be urged why these women who have the provincial franchise in these five provinces should not have the franchise for the Dominion? My hon. friend's Bill reads:

> The qualifications necessary to enable any male person to vote at a Dominion election in any province shall, except as in the Act otherwise provided, be those established by the laws of that province as necessary to entitle such

male person to vote in the same part of the province at a provincial election.

In a subsequent part of the Bill there are provisions to exclude some of the women who to-day are voters in the provinces. Those of alien origin who have been naturalized since 31st March, 1902, are excluded. If the amendment of my hon. friend from Humboldt were accepted, the Bill would read:

> The qualifications necessary to enable any male or female person to vote at a Dominion election in any province shall, except as by this Act otherwise provided, be those established by the laws of that province as necessary to entitle such male or female person to vote in the same part of the province at a provincial election.

Necessarily, if this provision were accepted, it would have to be qualified later on by the same provision which excludes men of alien birth from voting. That would follow as a consequence; a certain number of those women might be excluded also, and in the same way a certain number of men are excluded from the franchise. At all events, the franchise would remain to those women who are not wives of aliens, but the wives of British subjects by birth or otherwise. That cannot be contemplated by the Act, and it seems to me that no good reason has been advanced by the Secretary of State why the amendment of the hon. member for Humboldt should not be accepted. It all comes back to this: Shall women have the franchise or not. My hon. friend has stated, and the Prime Minister repeated, that the only basis for suffrage for women was service and sacrifice. Well, there are different degrees of sacrifice. There is greater service and there is less service. It is a question of degree. But, at all events, nobody can deny that there has been service. It is freely recognized by the Prime Minister, and by the Secretary of State, that all classes of women have been serving. Some have served to the limit of their ability, but all have made more or less sacrifice. Under the circumstances, if the principle is to be adopted it should be followed in all its consequences, especially in these provinces where the women have the provincial franchise, and where it is thought by a majority of the electors that they should be permitted to participate in the rights exercised by men.

Mr. MEIGHEN: I draw attention of the leader of the Opposition to the fact that section 6 provides the list, and does not give the franchise. Section 6 says:

> For the purpose of any Dominion election held within the limits of a province the voters' list shall, except as herein otherwise provided . . . .

What is "otherwise provided"?

Section 10 reads:

> The qualifications necessary to entitle any person to vote at a Dominion election in any province shall, except as herein otherwise provided, be those established by the laws of that province as necessary to entitle such person to vote in the same part of the province at a provincial election.

And other sections say that minors and judges shall not vote. The franchise is provided for in other sections. This section provides how the list of those qualified in that way shall be compiled as the list for the election. The courts have held, rightly or wrongly, that the word "person" as used in relating to the franchise, cannot be held to include both sexes. I am not arguing whether the law courts are right or wrong. The law officers of the Crown have advised—and I have looked into it as carefully as I can—that that is the effect of the decision.

Mr. PUGSLEY: Has the question ever come before the courts in Canada?

Mr. MEIGHEN: The question never came before the courts of Canada, but it has been decided in the courts of England under precisely similar conditions.

Mr. PUGSLEY: It is very different there.

Mr. MEIGHEN: I want to explain the reason why our point of view was arrived at. I did not rely on my own opinion in the matter. The opinion given by our law officers is very powerfully supported. It is quite true that, if the amendment moved by the hon. member for Humboldt were adopted, by a few changes later on, the law could be made to adjust itself and have the effect the hon. leader of the Opposition contends for, namely, that of including in the female franchise all those who are in a similar position to those included in the male franchise. But I contend that that would not be a fair effect, for three reasons. First, because of our naturalization laws many women would be enabled to get the franchise after one year's residence in Canada. Second, the representative compensating character and value would be altogether removed from the franchise. A great deal would be done, it is true, in the way of giving the franchise to the women of Canada, but no special compensation would be

given to the soldier. From the electoral standpoint, the provision would be of just as much service to the slacker at home as it would be to the soldier overseas; indeed, it would be of more service to the former. Lastly, the change would not follow a clear, bold line of sacrifice. I know that there are other lines of service than that of having a son or a brother at the front; there is very useful service, frequently the best that any woman can give. But you cannot measure that kind of service. We were asked yesterday to include in the provisions of this Bill those who knitted socks for the soldiers. How many socks? Half a sock, one sock, two socks or a thousand socks? We have to adopt a bold, clear line; we have to take the line that differentiates those who make the highest sacrifice from those who make what must be described as a minor sacrifice.

Mr. PUGSLEY: My hon. friend is seeking to cast ridicule upon the work of the women in making socks for the soldiers.

Mr. MEIGHEN: Not at all.

Mr. PUGSLEY: The women of this country, as has been admitted, have made every sacrifice it has been possible for them to make in connection with the war. I submit that no argument can be offered against the desirability and justice of giving them the right to vote. I am willing to support the amendment moved by the member for Humbold (Mr. Neely). If nothing more can be done for the women of the country, at least the franchise ought not to be taken away from them in the provinces where they now enjoy it. The Solicitor-General knows that he is taking away the right of franchise from some of the women of Canada. He puts in as the qualification for voting the words which are applied to Alberta, Saskatchewan and the Yukon, and he repeals or suspends during the period of the war this section which gives the qualification to women in those other provinces. The qualifications for all the provinces but Alberta, Saskatchewan and the Yukon are the provincial lists, whether they include men or women. Section 10 of the Dominion Elections Act, which is suspended by this measure, reads as follows:

> The qualifications necessary to entitle any person to vote at a Dominion election in any province shall, except as herein otherwise provided, be those established by the laws of that province as necessary to entitle such person to vote in the same part of the province at a provincial election.

Mr. MEIGHEN: That is not what we suspend.

Mr. PUGSLEY: Why did not my hon. friend continue that section as the section providing the qualification? He does not do that; he provides that the qualification set out in section 32 shall be the qualification throughout the Dominion.

Mr. MEIGHEN: Not at all.

Mr. PUGSLEY: In other words, instead of providing for the smaller portions of Canada—Saskatchewan, Alberta and the Yukon—the same qualification that the Dominion Elections Act provides for the rest of the Dominion, he provides that the qualification in respect to those three districts shall apply to the whole Dominion. He suspends the operation of section 10 and brings into force the operation of section 32. As he knows, section 10 applies to all of Canada, except Saskatchewan, Alberta and the Yukon, and section 32 relates only to Saskatchewan and Alberta.

Mr. MEIGHEN: We do not do that at all.

Mr. PUGSLEY: My hon. friend does, because he suspends the whole of part I.

Mr. MEIGHEN: My hon. friend has made a curious mistake.

Mr. PUGSLEY: I have not made a curious mistake.

Mr. MEIGHEN: My hon. friend has it exactly upside down. We repeal section 32 as it is and we adopt section 10 and put it in this Bill.

Mr. PUGSLEY: My hon. friend is wrong. By section 1 of the Bill it is provided that during the war and until the completion of demobilization after the conclusion of peace, the operation of part 1 of the Dominion Election Act shall be suspended.

Mr. MEIGHEN: But we take section 10 and put it in; and we repeal section 32.

Mr. PUGSLEY: No, my hon. friend does not put in section 10.

Mr. MEIGHEN: We do, but we use the word " male."

Mr. PUGSLEY: Instead of using the word " person " as it is used in the whole of the Dominion Elections Act except that part of it which applies to Alberta, Saskatchewan and the Yukon Territory, my hon. friend puts in the word "male." Notwithstanding the advice of the Justice Department, he is not willing to take the

chance that the word "person" means male person. He inserts the word "male," and thereby limits the franchise to male persons in Canada. Surely that is altering the law with regard to women having the right to vote. I affirm, notwithstanding what the Minister of Justice says, that if a woman, whether married or unmarried, is a person in the eye of the law, she has the right to vote in every province where her name appears on the provincial lists, except in the provinces of Alberta, Saskatchewan and the Yukon Territory. My hon. friend says that he goes by some judgment of a court in England. Well, that judgment was given a long time ago, in a special case, and at a time when women in England were looked upon not as persons, but as chattels. They were the property of their husbands, to all intents and purposes; when they were married whatever they had in the way of personal property went over to the husband by virtue of the marriage contract. That judgment was delivered at a time when people were imbued with the idea laid down by Blackstone that the English law was very tender in dealing with the married woman when it permitted the husband to beat his wife only to a moderate degree. That was the view held in those days as to the status of woman. But through legislation and the decision of the courts, the status of woman has gradually become enlarged. To-day the law of England and of Canada recognizes her as a person, having civil rights just as a man has, and entitled to be recognized as a person. I believe that all the courts of the country, if the question came up, would recognize "woman" as a "person." But as I have said, the Solicitor General is afraid to rest upon the interpretation which would be given to the word person, and so afraid is he of that, and so desirous is he of making it sure that the women of Ontario, Manitoba, Saskatchewan, Alberta and British Columbia shall not be allowed to vote, that he puts the word "male" before the word "person." My hon. friend says that he also rests upon the view of the Department of Justice. I happen to have before me an opinion which has been expressed by a gentleman who formerly occupied the position of Deputy Minister of Justice in Canada, an eminent lawyer, a gentleman who stands at the very top notch amongst the legal men of Canada, a gentleman of great learning and a very high authority. I refer to Mr. Z. A. Lash, and this is his opinion as expressed recently in an address to the University of Toronto:

> After the Ontario Act giving votes to women has been finally passed, as the Dominion election law now stands women, whose names are on the Ontario voters' lists, would be entitled to vote at Dominion elections. This affords a remarkable illustration of the interlocking of Dominion and provincial jurisdictions and machinery, all working together smoothly and in accordance with the spirit of the constitution.

Mr. MORPHY: How does the hon. member, apart from any court decisions, get over our own Dominion Act as to what constitutes a voter?

Mr. PUGSLEY: In what way?

Mr. MORPHY: On page 90 of this book of instructions, we find "Information for electors," which says:

> The following is the qualification of electors as prescribed by the Parliament of Canada:
> Every male person shall be qualified to vote at the election of a member under this Act.

Sir WILFRID LAURIER: What section is that?

Mr. MORPHY: It is in one of the schedules arising out of the Act.

Mr. PUGSLEY: I will tell my hon. friend how I shall get over it. My hon. friend happens to be reading the instructions to the electors of Saskatchewan and Alberta.

Mr. MORPHY: One further question.

Mr. PUGSLEY: That is the answer to the first.

Mr. MORPHY: On page 97 there appear the oaths to be taken by electors. The first oath is:

> You do swear that you are of the male sex and a British subject.

Mr. PUGSLEY: If my hon. friend will read the oath carefully, he will find that those are the instructions to and the oath to be taken by the electors in the provinces of Saskatchewan and Alberta and in the Yukon—

Mr. MORPHY: Oh, no.

Mr. PUGSLEY: —and only in those provinces and in that territory. Let me show my hon. friend that I am right. This is very important, and I am glad my hon. friend called attention to it. If my hon. friend will look at section 35, which starts with the words—

> In the provinces of Saskatchewan and Alberta.

—he will find that it refers to the proclamation in Form G. Section 32 of this Bill. It says:

In the provinces of Saskatchewan and Alberta, except as in this Act otherwise provided, every male person shall be qualified to vote at the election of a member under this Act, who, not being an Indian, is a British subject and of the full age of twenty-one years, and has resided in either of the said provinces for at least twelve months.

I am sure my hon. friend will find that the information to which he has referred is the information relating entirely to the voters of Saskatchewan, Alberta and the Yukon Territory.

Mr. MORPHY: How about the oath? Are you going to make a woman swear that she is a man?

Mr. PUGSLEY: I am answering one thing at a time. We shall now come to the oath. The oath, which my hon. friend dwells upon and which is to be found upon page 97, says:

You do swear that you are of the male sex and a British subject, that you are not an Indian, that you are of the full age of twenty-one years, and that you have resided in the province of Saskatchewan or Alberta or the Yukon Territory (as the case may be) for at least twelve months.

Mr. MORPHY: All right.

Mr. PUGSLEY: If my hon. friend will turn to section 61 he will find that that form is the form provided specifically for Saskatchewan, Alberta, and the Yukon Territory.

Mr. MORPHY: The electors must be males.

Mr. PUGSLEY: Section 61 says:

Every deputy returning officer in the provinces of Saskatchewan and Alberta and the Yukon Territory may, and shall, when he is required so to do by any candidate or agent of a candidate, administer to any elector either one or both of the oaths set forth in Form Z.

That is the form to which my hon. friend has referred and which I have just read, and the form which is limited expressly to Saskatchewan, and to Alberta, and to the Yukon Territory.

Mr. MORPHY: It deals with male persons, not with female persons. There is nothing about females there.

Mr. PUGSLEY: Of course, it deals with male persons, because part II, relating to Saskatchewan, Alberta, and the Yukon Territory, expressly limits the franchise to male persons.

Mr. CURRIE: May I ask my hon. friend a question?

Mr. PUGSLEY: Just wait one minute.

Mr. CURRIE: My hon. friend might explain why all the French Canadian members except one have left the Chamber, and that one is now leaving.

Mr. PUGSLEY: I suppose they have a perfect right to leave, and I am gratified my hon. friends have remained while I am addressing the committee. I have a good attendance before me and I have not felt the loss of my French Canadian friends. I will refer to section 153. I feel my hon. friend from North Perth (Mr. Morphy) is entitled to have an answer to his question, because he does not suggest ridiculous things in this House.

Mr. MORPHY: Take your time.

Mr. PUGSLEY: Section 153 says:

Except in the provinces of Saskatchewan and Alberta and the Yukon Territory, an elector, if required by the deputy returning officer, the poll clerk, one of the candidates, or an agent of a candidate, or by any elector present, shall, before receiving his ballot paper, take such oath of qualification as by the laws of the province he may in the like case at a provincial election be required to take, such changes having been made in the form of oath as are necessary to make it applicable to the election being held, and there being added to such oaths, or substituted therein for any clauses dealing with the like matters or any of them, the clauses set forth in Form Y.

Let us see if Form Y, which is on page 97, says anything about being a male voter. Form Y says:

You swear (or solemnly affirm),—
That you have not been disfranchised under the provisions of the Disfranchising Act, or for corrupt practices under the Dominion Elections Act;
That you have not voted before at this election, either at this or at any other polling station;
That you have not received anything, . . .
That you have not, directly or indirectly, paid or promised anything to any person either to induce him to vote or to refrain from voting at this election.

There is no oath or affirmation there that the voter is a male person.

Mr. MORPHY: This only gives the corrupt practices part of it. It does not make the voter swear that he is a British subject.

Mr. PUGSLEY: Can my hon. friend show me where in the Dominion Elections Act the voter is required to swear that he is a male person except in Saskatchewan, Alberta, and the Yukon Territory?

Mr. MORPHY: I have not searched for that.

Mr. PUGSLEY: Well, I have. I did so when I moved a resolution in this House

two sessions ago. My hon. friend can search the Dominion Elections Act from beginning to end and examine all the forms, and nowhere will he find the requirement that the voter shall be a male person. The requirements of the statute, and the forms, proclamations and oaths which relate to male persons are limited entirely to those provisions relating to the provinces of Saskatchewan and Alberta and the Yukon Territory. I can assure my hon. friend that he has only to look at the statute to see that I am absolutely right. But the Secretary of State in this Bill is taking away the right of the women to vote; at all events the right of the women of the provinces of Ontario, Manitoba and British Columbia, where if they are persons they have the right to vote. My hon. friend may say they are not persons, but I say they are; a woman has always been recognized as a person in reality and in law, though law sometimes differs from reality. The women of Alberta and Saskatchewan are also on the provincial lists, and this Bill takes away the right which those women have by law to-day to cast their ballots at an election for the Dominion Parliament. My hon. friend has made it clear he is doing that, because he has put in the words "male person" and has made it applicable to the whole of Canada. Therefore, no matter what franchise may be given by any provincial legislature in Canada, when this Bill goes into force, notwithstanding any provincial franchise giving women the right to vote, their names will be struck off the provincial lists. That is wrong, and therefore I am prepared to vote, and vote heartily, for the amendment of my hon. friend from Humboldt.

Mr. KNOWLES: The question whether the amendment should carry is one of especial interest to a province like my own, where the franchise has been extended to our women citizens. I am a supporter of the amendment moved by the hon. member for Humboldt, believing that it is an improvement on the legislation which the Government has brought down. I am not quarrelling with the legislation which the Government proposes on this particular feature, but I submit that the Government should give more consideration to the possibility that their legislation can be improved upon. It is unfortunate that the Government seems to take the position that because a suggestion comes from this side of the House it must be laughed out of court, or met with taunt, or sophistry, or something like that. The leader of the Government gets up and says that on a certain occasion the leader of the Opposition, or the hon. member for St. John, said something or other. That is the kind of answer we get to a serious suggestion, made with a view to improving the legislation submitted by the Government. It is comparatively unimportant what view the leader of the Opposition, or the hon. member for St. John, held in the past with regard to women suffrage. The question, as I understand it, is whether it is right and just and in the country's interest that we should extend the franchise to the women in those provinces where the franchise has been granted for provincial purposes. Let us address ourselves for a moment to that question.

The Government manifestly has no lack of confidence in the ability of women to consider and arrive at a fair decision on the issues of the day. The very fact of the Government granting the franchise to certain women is in itself an admission that they believe the women of Canada are so mentally and morally endowed as to be able to pass judgment on the questions before the country. Now, if some women are capable of doing this, are not all women capable of it? No one suggests that the women relatives of soldiers are any different from other women, so far as assisting at a general election in this country is concerned. I can see no answer to that proposition; it admits of no debate. If we are to go as far as the Government goes we must, if we are to be consistent, go farther and give the franchise to all women who are entitled to it under the provincial law.

This legislation is but another example of the old practice of hon. gentlemen opposite, often done in good faith, because they have done it so often it has become a habit with them, of enacting class legislation. This legislation is but another form of privilegism; it is the last remove from democracy to give the vote to a mere handful of women and withhold it from the rest, for no reason at all except the flimsy, sophistical reason the Secretary of State has given. Now what is his reason? He says that if we were to give the vote to all women, it would be no prize to the soldiers' relatives. Those are not his exact words, but that was his idea, framed in his own beautiful language, which I could not for a moment imitate, and the sophistry of which I trust I never for one moment shall. He says it would be a departure from the compensating feature to the soldiers' relatives. That is to say, all women

are entitled to the vote, but we are withholding it from the majority because we wish to give the privilege to the soldiers' relatives. We wish to show them some favouritism, as a sort of compensation for themselves and themselves alone. That is class legislation; the principle is wrong and vicious. The reason given by the Secretary of State is one that will not stand analysis. Let us give to the soldier or to his relatives anything under heaven that will commence to compensate in any real sense for the sacrifice that they have made, but surely the soldiers' relatives would be the very last to be so unreasonable as to say: "Let us be the dog in the manger. Let us, and us alone, have the vote to which all women are entitled." Why should the women relatives of soldiers be thankful because the vote is kept from other women? The Secretary of State does not rightly understand the womanhood of Canada if he thinks these women will rejoice in the fact of being in a position of solitary majesty of their own, while their sisters are not able to exercise the franchise which they have received. I think my hon. friend had better get some better reason than that, and in all friendship and courtesy I suggest that he ask that this amendment stand for a little while that he may consider it, and if there is an entire absence, as there seems to be, of any real, cogent reason against the amendment, then let the amendment go through. There is no man more ready to admit the accomplishments of the Secretary of State than myself, but I do think that for some of the reasons he gives in this House when he goes home at night he must be ashamed; I cannot say in Parliamentary language that I think he should be ashamed of himself, but I certainly do think that he should be ashamed of his reasons. We had the Ross rifle for a while sending our boys to sleep in France and Flanders, when they should have been full-blooded boys, and the reason the Solicitor General gave for continuing to supply our men with that rifle was that we were liable for an action for damages if we broke our contract. Then he gave us free wheat, because he wanted peace on earth with the farmers out West. Yesterday he told us he was taking away the vote from people of enemy birth to protect the State, and when I confronted him with the terms of the naturalization certificate, whereby Canada pledges herself to give all political rights in this country to these men, the only reason he had to give was that in Saskatchewan they did something to the Chinese, and in British Columbia they did something else. There are four illustrations of reasons that the Secretary of State has put up, and I am bound to do him the compliment of saying they are not worthy of him. I trust he will look into all these matters—the reason of the Ross rifle, the reason of the free wheat, the reason for disfranchising the Germans because they did something to the Chinese, and the reason he gives now that he keeps the vote from all women because he says it would not be any special compensation to soldiers' wives if the rest of Canada got it. I would ask that the matter receive further consideration of the Government, and be not turned down for no reason at all that I can see, except it comes from this side of the House.

Mr. OLIVER: I must admit the Secretary of State has made the position of the Government perfectly clear. It is the deliberate intention of this Government in this Bill, as in the Military Voters' Bill, to establish in the Dominion of Canada a military voting caste, for the purpose of perpetuating the present Government in power. They are doing this without any parliamentary authority, and without the authority of the people, and by Parliament which is very little more than half representative. Such an exhibition of autocracy Canada never saw before, and we must take it for granted that a continuation of our hon. friends in their present position will give Canada more examples of autocracy such as the Kaiser will be glad to hear of.

Mr. MEIGHEN: My hon. friend (Mr. Pugsley) stated that these decisions were arrived at in England in the old prehistoric times when women were chattels, and men beat their wives. As a matter of fact, the decision was in 1909 and is quoted in the Appeal Cases.

Amendment, Mr. Neely, declared lost.

Mr. McCRANEY: In view of the defeat of the amendment moved by my hon. friend from Humboldt (Mr. Neely) and of the objections made to it by the Government, I desire to move the following amendment, which I hope will overcome the objection. I beg to move:

That section 1 be amended by adding after the word "war" in line 34, the words "or is a natural born British subject qualified as to age, race, and residence, as required in the case of a male person in such province or in the Yukon Territory."

The effect of that would be to enfranchise every woman who is a natural born

British subject, and get rid of the objection which the Secretary of State made in regard to the woman coming from Sweden, who lived here for a year and had the right to vote.

Mr. MEIGHEN: It gets rid of the objection as to the anomaly of naturalization. but it does not meet the main points at all, namely, that the whole representative value of the vote is gone, and the line of service and sacrifice is destroyed.

Mr. MARCIL: Referring to the following paragraph, will the Secretary of State tell me what is meant by the words " in any of the military forces." Does it mean the military forces of Britain and Canada alone, or the military forces of the Allies as well.

Mr. MEIGHEN: Not the Allies.

Mr. MARCIL: Why not? We have thousands of Belgians and French who left Canada for the front. Why should not the wives and relatives of these men have the right to vote?

Mr. MEIGHEN: That is worth considering.

Mr. PUGSLEY: When I brought the matter up first, the Minister of Justice promised me they would have that right.

Mr. MEIGHEN: I will take it into consideration.

Amendment, Mr. McCraney, lost on division.

Ayes 16; Nays 38.

Mr. McKENZIE: Perhaps the minister will tell us something about the words "naval forces" used in paragraph 33a. We have only two warships, or so-called warships. I would like to know what is meant by the qualification of men serving on the naval forces? Is it confined to men who have been engaged on those two vessels?

Sir ROBERT BORDEN: The Minister of Marine and Fisheries can give more information as to the exact details of the naval forces. My hon. friend is no doubt aware that in addition to the force he has mentioned there are patrol boats in the Department of the Naval Service. Those boats are doing very good service on the coast of several of the provinces of Canada.

Mr. McKENZIE: The Canada for instance, was in service many years before the war. I am not aware that the service on her is any different now to what it was before the outbreak of hostilities. Conditions on the Canada and similar vessels are not changed, so far as I know.

Sir ROBERT BORDEN: Speaking generally, and subject to fuller explanation by the Minister of the Naval Service. I would understand it to include all those vessels engaged in war service under the direction of the Department of Naval Service.

Mr. CARVELL: I feel that I would like to have a little more information on this particular point. As I understand this, boys who enlist in the Naval Service become soldiers or members of the Canadian navy. Many of these are minors. Many of them are trained in Canada. I know that there are many of them in Halifax. On what ground do the Government grant the franchise to the mothers and sisters of these boys who have never left Canada, and refuse the franchise to the mothers and sisters of men who have enlisted and who are at Valcartier or a hundred other places in Canada but who have not left Canada? The female relatives of these men will not receive the franchise, whereas the female relatives of the boys who have enlisted in the navy will. Surely we have sufficient discriminations in this Bill without going to that extent?

Mr. MEIGHEN: There may be something substantial in the argument of the hon. member for Carleton (Mr. Carvell). His apprehension is quite correct that the female relatives of those who have not left Canada are not included in the words "in any of the military forces, or within or without Canada." It may be that there should be a limitation to make the Act fair. The reason generally for using the words "within or without Canada" with reference to the naval forces is that one man suffers just the same as the other. A man engaged on the sea is not in Canada, strictly speaking, but he is on the waters surrounding Canada. That is why the Act is drawn as it is. If you used the words "within Canada" you would exclude many of these men who should be included. It may be that there are some who should not be included. If there are such as the hon. gentleman describes who are simply in training and who have never been in actual service, it may be that a change should be made in the wording of the clause to exclude them. I will look into it at once.

Mr. CARVELL: I am glad my hon. friend is going to do that, and I hope he will amend the Act so as either not to exclude some or to include many others. The hon.

gentleman has had pointed out to him the discrimination that is being exercised in favour of certain persons and against many others in Canada. I hope that while the Solicitor General is trying to recast this Act, he will see if he cannot make it a little fairer to a great many people in Canada. However, we will have a chance of discussing this after recess.

At six o'clock the Committee adjourned.

After Recess.

The Committee resumed at eight o'clock.

On section 33B—Provincial disqualifications not adopted:

Mr. OLIVER: I think section 33A was under discussion when the committee rose. The hon. gentleman from Carleton raised a question in regard to the second and third last lines of this section, and asked for explanation.

Mr. MEIGHEN: Yes, we will take it up when the hon. gentleman arrives. I think I am safe in saying that section 33B is the same as section 11, part 1 of the present Act, and consequently had to be inserted here, in order to make it applicable to the whole measure.

Mr. OLIVER: I may be a little short in my ability to follow the reading, but it does not seem to me that the connection is well established between the first paragraph and the subsequent paragraphs.

Mr. MEIGHEN: I was troubled in the same way when first reading it. The section reads:

> No person possessed of the qualifications generally by the provincial law to entitle him to vote at a provincial election shall be disqualified from voting at a Dominion election merely by reason of any provision of the provincial law disqualifying him from having his name on the list or from voting.

The objects of the disqualification are the four classes described in the paragraphs following,—first, the holder of an office; second, any person employed in any capacity in the public service of Canada; and so on.

Mr. OLIVER: I can understand what it means, and I hope the minister will not think me pernickety if I say that it does not seem to me to say what it means.

Sir ROBERT BORDEN: I think it is quite clear. It is precisely the same form as section 11 of the Dominion Elections Act which reads, leaving out the immaterial words:

> No person shall be disqualified by reason of any provincial law disqualifying him, (a) the holder of any office, (b) any person employed in any capacity in the public service of Canada.

And so forth.

Mr. OLIVER: If it read as the Prime Minister reads it it would be all right. But it does not read that way.

Sir ROBERT BORDEN: I think so.

Mr. OLIVER: Well, I withdraw my objection.

Sir ROBERT BORDEN: I read it leaving out the immaterial words.

Mr. OLIVER: But when the words are in it does not read in the same sense.

Sir ROBERT BORDEN: The section reads:

> No person possessed of the qualifications generally required by the provincial law to entitle him to vote at a provincial election shall be disqualified from voting at a Dominion election merely by reason of any provision of the provincial law disqualifying him from having his name on the list or from voting—
> (a) the holder of any office; or
> (b) any person employed in any capacity in the public service of Canada or of the province.

Mr. McKENZIE: Why does the minister insert there the word "generally?" If the person has the qualifications he has them, and that is all there is about it.

Sir ROBERT BORDEN: We are following precisely the present section in the Dominion Elections Act. It seems to me quite plain. No person possessed of qualifications generally which would entitle him to vote shall be disqualified by this provision under the provincial law.

Mr. McKENZIE: It would be better to say: "No person possessed of the qualifications required by the provincial law." There is no general qualification.

Mr. MEIGHEN: There would be a contradiction in terms if we adopted that suggestion, because the section then, in effect, would say: "No person possessed of the qualifications required by the provincial law shall, by reason of some of the qualifications themselves, be disqualified." If he has the general qualifications, this particular section will not disqualify him for Dominion purposes.

On paragraph (f)—Posting proclamation:

Mr. MEIGHEN: Under the Alberta and Saskatchewan provisions the list, as compiled by the enumerators, is posted up

eight days before election day, and we are enlarging that to ten days.

Mr. McCRANEY: That is all right. Is it under this Bill, or under the Soldiers' Votes Bill, that you take four weeks between nomination and election? The time between the issue of the writ and election day will be much longer under these newer conditions than previously, and it is desirable that we should have a much longer time than ten days for the posting of the lists, because the enumerator will certainly require a great deal of time.

The returning officer will receive his writs, lay out his polling subdivisions and appoint his enumerators. There will then be, possibly, a month before nomination day, and a further period of four weeks after that before the election is held. But the lists should be put up a good deal more than ten days before the election.

Sir ROBERT BORDEN: I do not quite understand why my hon. friend thinks that a longer period between nomination day and polling day should affect this particular provision.

Mr. McCRANEY: My recollection is that under ordinary conditions a period of five weeks should be sufficient from the issue of the writ to the holding of the poll. Eight or ten days would then be all that could be allowed between the putting up of the lists and the holding of the poll—that is, giving the returning officer and the enumerators time to prepare their lists. In view of the fact that in this case time will be necessary to take the soldiers' vote, a period of four weeks is being set between nomination day and election day. Under the circumstances, that is all right; but that very fact should give you a longer period between the issue of the writ and the holding of the poll. Where five or six weeks was formerly sufficient, you now require probably ten weeks. In view of these considerations, you should have the enumerators lists completed and in the hands of the public by nomination day. The old law provided that the enumerators' lists should be posted up in public places the day before nomination day. There was plenty of time between the issue of the writ and nomination day for getting out the enumerators' lists. Even at ten days, therefore, the period between the posting of the lists and the holding of the poll is altogether too short. If you provided that the lists should be posted up the day before nomination day, you would give your enumerators as much time as they have had hitherto, and the public would have much better satisfaction. The enumerators' lists are of very little use to the Opposition party if they are put up only eight days before the election.

The Government candidate will likely assist in preparing the lists, and he will have access to them, but the Opposition candidate cannot do that. The Government party has all the material, and the Opposition party has not any. For that reason I think that the principle of the law as it stands should stand now; that the lists should be put up by the enumerators the day before nomination day.

Mr. MEIGHEN: It would never do to go that far. My hon. friend's contention is that, whereas five weeks were formerly sufficient between the issue of the writ and the day of the election, more than five weeks will now be necessary, because the period of a week prior to nomination day will not be sufficient to enable the proclamation to issue.

Mr. McCRANEY: Certainly.

Mr. MEIGHEN: I think the period of a week is not very far from sufficient. At all events, I am informed that the one week will be almost sufficient. It must be remembered that we have already made provision for earlier posting up of the notices—ten instead of eight days before the election.

Mr. McCRANEY: How long before election day will the lists issue from Ottawa?

Mr. MEIGHEN: Between five and six weeks.

Mr. McCRANEY: The hon. gentleman will not get along with anything like that. The returning officer gets the writ; the Government candidate brings in those who are familiar with the district in question and gets them to lay out the polls. It takes a good deal of time to lay out the polls in some of the western constituencies. In my last election there were 147 polls in my constituency. Just imagine what it means to get men who are familiar with all the different districts, have them meet the convenience of settlers in making the necessary arrangements, see that the polls are laid out, get your enumerators appointed, see to the posting up of the proclamation, and things of that kind.

Mr. MEIGHEN: You adopt the provincial poll.

Mr. McCRANEY: I am speaking now of a Dominion election.

Mr. MEIGHEN: But in the Dominion election, the provincial polls are adopted under paragraph (g).

Mr. McCRANEY: The hon. gentleman will find that the boundaries of the Dominion constituencies do not coincide with those of the provincial constituencies. Moreover, there are provincial polls in Saskatchewan only in the cities and in the country districts the same procedure has to be had as is the case in Dominion elections.

Mr. MEIGHEN: I do not see how there can be no provincial polls in the country districts.

Mr. McCRANEY: In Saskatchewan, I understand, the procedure is practically the same as it is in the Dominion. We follow the old Dominion law in respect of rural districts; the polls are laid out at each election, because there are no voters' lists.

Mr. MEIGHEN: But they know where the polls were in the previous provincial elections.

Mr. McCRANEY: Not always; new settlements are springing up, new conditions have to be met. Of course, the matter is somewhat simplified by having information as to the polls used at the previous election, but in this case much of that information would be lost, because it is six years old.

Mr. MEIGHEN: It is only two or three months old.

Mr. McCRANEY: I was thinking of the last Dominion election. In view of the fact that a period of eight or ten weeks is provided between the issue of the writ in Ottawa and the taking of the poll, a much longer time should be given than has hitherto been provided between the posting of the enumerators' writs and the holding of the poll. The law now says that the lists shall be posted up the day before nomination. That should be the law in this case, because the returning officers and enumerators will have just as much time under the amended law as they had before.

Mr. MEIGHEN: The hon. gentleman is familiar with the working of the Dominion Elections Act in Saskatchewan and has an acquaintance with the kind of constituency where the period required would be the longest. But we worked this out pretty carefully, and we really think that we can bring the election on within six weeks from the date of the issue of the writ. We may be wrong in that, but we cannot be very far out. Every member in the House is anxious that the time be no longer than that, if possible; six weeks between the issue of the writ and the day of the election is just about enough of that kind of stress and turmoil. We are going to try to bring it on within that time. It may be that a slightly longer period could be allowed, but it seemed to us that ten days was enough for all that there was to do. Possibly twelve days might be allowed; we shall consider that.

Mr. McCRANEY: Under the law as it now stands the public are to be in possession of the enumerators' lists at the moment the candidates are in the field. The candidates are in the field one week before election day, and one day before that the lists are to be posted up so that the public shall be in possession of the lists when the candidates formally take the field.

Mr. MEIGHEN: There is no real connection between nomination day and the posting of the writs.

Mr. McCRANEY: I think the intention was that when the candidates went into the field, the public should have possession of the lists upon which the voting was to take place.

Mr. MEIGHEN: I do not see the connection between the nomination day and the posting of the lists. I do see that the fullest time possible should be given between the time the lists are posted and election day in order to enable a candidate to reach the electors, to provide for his getting about as much as possible, but I do not see that nomination day has anything to do with it. We shall see, however, if we can make the time any longer.

Mr. McCRANEY: What does the minister think about extending the time?

Mr. MEIGHEN: I have made a note of the matter to see if we can make the time longer. All we have to do is to add an amendment to this section. There are some other things that have to be changed also.

On paragraph (g)—Subdivision of electoral district into polling divisions:

Mr. MURPHY: Do I understand that the words inserted and the words added form one new section?

Mr. MEIGHEN: This is all an amendment to section 37.

Mr. A. K. MACLEAN: I would suggest that when the Bill is reprinted the addition commencing in line 32 with the words "he may adopt", which is in inverted commas,

be dropped down a line and made to commence a new paragraph. It is very confusing to have words inserted in that way. The same applies to the words inserted commencing in line 25 with the words "except in the provinces".

Mr. MURPHY: That is the reason I asked the question.

Mr. MEIGHEN: That is right.

On subsection 3—Separate and additional polling stations where polling division has more than 300 voters:

Mr. MEIGHEN: Subdivision 3 comprises exactly sections 28 and 29 of the old Act.

Mr. MURPHY: This is just breaking up one subdivision into two where there are more than 300 voters.

Mr. MEIGHEN: Yes.

Mr. McCRANEY: In regard to what I had to say as to paragraph (f), I may say that I had the provincial law in mind. My hon. friend need not bother any further making a note of the matter.

Sir WILFRID LAURIER: I was under the impression that this was the law as it exists to-day.

Mr. MEIGHEN: Yes.

Sir WILFRID LAURIER: Why repudiate it here then?

Mr. MEIGHEN: The reason is this: In our first section we say that, during the present war, part I shall be suspended. But there are two or three sections in part I which we cannot suspend, but which should be brought in in their proper place here.

Mr. MURPHY: Like section 10 which we discussed this afternoon.

Mr. MEIGHEN: Yes, section 10 was one; section 11 was another, and this is a third.

On subsection 4—Returning officer to obtain documents defining provincial polling divisions:

Mr. MEIGHEN: This is section 22 of the old Act. There is no change at all.

Mr. McKENZIE: That could not apply to Nova Scotia then.

Mr. MEIGHEN: It applies everywhere, just as it did before. It was section 22 of part I which applied everywhere outside of Alberta and Saskatchewan.

Mr. OLIVER: Subsection 4 is not absolutely identical with section 22 of the old Act. In section 22, there is a paragraph (b), which is not contained in subsection 4. It may not be necessary, but I am calling attention to the fact that subsection 4 is not actually a reproduction of section 22.

Mr. MEIGHEN: I should have mentioned that. The reason is that paragraph b of section 22 of the existing Act refers to provincial lists. As there are none in this case, of course, it is not applicable.

On subsection 5—Certified copies of provincial lists to be obtained:

Mr. MEIGHEN: That is section 23 of the old Act.

Mr. MURPHY: In connection with the reprinting of the Act, may I add to the suggestion of my hon. friend from Halifax (Mr. A. K. Maclean) the further one that, where an existing section is reprinted for the reasons stated by the Solicitor General a few minutes ago, that might be indicated by a different kind of type, or by a foot note, or something of that kind. This section is divided up in a different manner from that in which it is printed in the original Act.

Sir ROBERT BORDEN: I suppose, after the measure passes, it will be necessary to print part II of the Dominion Elections Act with these amendments, as otherwise it would be impossible for a returning officer, or indeed any one else, to understand it without a good deal of study.

Mr. MEIGHEN: We shall have to reprint not only part II, but the whole Act.

Sir ROBERT BORDEN: And the Military Voters' Act with it.

Mr. A. K. MACLEAN: I would suggest that the latter part of section 33B be made a new section. In the same section there are two separate amendments very much mixed up. The Solicitor General might keep that in mind.

Mr. MEIGHEN: It may be possible to have the Act read sections 1, 2, 3, 4, and so on, in which case section 33B can be made a new section. I am not quite sure whether that is possible or not. The usual provisions of a revision will be followed in reprinting the whole Act.

On paragraph (h)—appointment of enumerators to make lists.

Mr. J. J. HUGHES: I want to bring to the notice of the committee the Secretary of State and the Prime Minister, the special conditions with regard to Prince Edward

Island. In that province we have no lists at all either for Dominion or for provincial elections. We have vote by ballot. A good many years ago we had lists, and I heard the candidates, men in public life at that time, saying that the preparations of those lists and the revision of them from time to time caused them more trouble and expense than the holding of an election.

But that system was abolished. Since then both Conservative and Liberal Governments have been in power in that province, and the present system works so well that nobody thinks of making a change. And I feel that if the Government could see its way clear to leave conditions as they are in that province it would be very satisfactory to the people there. There is no insuperable difficulty in the way, I should think. I was very much impressed the other day by the remarks of the hon. member for Saskatoon (Mr. McCraney), who is a moderate and a reasonable man, to the effect that the method provided in this Bill for drawing up the lists was practically the same as that which prevailed in the provinces of Saskatchewan and Alberta some years ago, which was found to lend itself to improper practices, more particularly to what is called the tied ballot. I should be very sorry to see anything like that introduced into Prince Edward Island, where we are getting along first-rate, and where there is not even a suggestion of tampering with the ballot or anything of that kind. I think it would be very unfortunate if we now introduced into the province a system which might give rise to a suspicion of improper practices such as took place in Saskatchewan and Alberta some years ago.

If we had no lists, no enumerators would be required, and that much money would be saved. It might not amount to a great deal, but it would be a saving just the same. I suppose there are about 130 polls in the province, and there would be an enumerator for each poll, at a cost, say, of $100 apiece, which would not be extravagant. That would amount to $13,000, which the Government might just as well save. I was speaking to the Secretary of State about this matter the other day, and he spoke very fairly about it, so far as I could judge, but I know he is a clever man, and, perhaps, he was just jollying me a little. He very fairly and frankly stated, however, that if the members from Prince Edward Island supporting the Government took the same view as I did, he would see that present conditions, so far as Prince Edward Island was concerned, continued. I have spoken to the members from Prince Edward Island supporting the Government, and while they have not given me any definite answer, they have very frankly stated that the enumerators under this Bill would practically be organizers for them.

Mr. MEIGHEN: I cannot agree with them on that.

Mr. J. J. HUGHES: The members were not very much interested, but undoubtedly they expected some party advantage from this method which they were unwilling to give up. I have an amendment here that I would commend to my hon. friend the Secretary of State.

Mr. MEIGHEN: If we were to accept it, the Act would have to be very greatly amended.

Mr. J. J. HUGHES: All that would be necessary, I think, would be to say that the provisions of this Bill with regard to the drawing up of the lists by enumerators should not apply to Prince Edward Island, but that every other provision would apply. The procedure there is very simple. An elector presents himself at the polling booth on election day and asks the deputy returning officer for a ballot, and in ninety-eight cases out of a hundred he is entitled to a ballot. In Prince Edward Island we have a homogeneous population and everybody knows everybody else, and the qualifications are very simple. If the agents of one of the candidates think that the man is not entitled to the ballot, objection is raised, and decided upon right there by the returning officer, and in ninety-nine cases out of a hundred satisfaction is given. If the returning officer has any doubt in his mind he puts the voter under oath. If conditions are left as they are in Prince Edward Island, it could do no possible harm to anybody.

Sir ROBERT BORDEN: Is it not a fact that under the system which my hon. friend commends in Prince Edward Island, the candidates themselves are put to the trouble and expense of preparing lists on their own behalf? It is perfectly true, as I understand it, that there are no official lists, but it does become necessary for candidates at an election in that province really to prepare their own lists.

Mr. J. J. HUGHES: Yes. But as I have already said everybody there is acquainted with everybody else, and there is no difficulty. The agents of each candidate prepare a small list for themselves, either

typewritten or handwritten, and there is no expense attached to it.

Sir ROBERT BORDEN: Do they not really have to perform all the duties which an enumerator has to perform, finding out who are the electors, where they reside, their names and so forth?

Mr. J. J. HUGHES: There is no trouble at all about that, because everybody there is acquainted with all his neighbours. The fact that the local government has adopted the system, and that nobody ever thinks of changing it, is the best proof that I can give to the Prime Minister and the committee that it suits local conditions. The present system saves trouble and expense.

Mr. MEIGHEN: The hon. member spoke to me about it, and I said virtually what he reports to the committee. I said that I thought it was a subject on which I might well be advised by the members from that province, Liberals as well as Conservatives. I have not had an opportunity since then to see any of the other members, but I have made inquiries from other sources, and I find there is this difficulty: If we were adopting entirely the same franchise as before, then in a province like Prince Edward Island, where there is little actual movement in and out of the population, and where everybody knows everybody else to a degree that does not obtain in other provinces, it is conceivable that perhaps the most convenient way would be to do without this. But even under those conditions I can remember hon. members from that province complaining to me at other times that they had to make their own lists, and that it was a matter of great expense to them. That might not be the case in the constituency of my hon. friend (Mr. J. J. Hughes), but in a constituency like Charlottetown, for instance, I can quite understand that it would put considerable extra expense on a candidate. I can remember that the figure was given to me as over the thousand dollar mark.

But the point is this: The same franchise is not adopted. Everybody of the male sex had the vote before, and it was easy to tell who did not vote, because virtually everybody did. Now it is very different. There may be some disfranchised as aliens, I doubt if there would be many, and there are certainly many of the female sex to be added. There will be many of the female sex who will be entitled to vote, and there will be very many who will not. Consequently, the question as to who votes, and who does not vote, is a much bigger question and requires more decision now than before. That is why we need the lists, otherwise it will be all left for decision until election day. I have not seen the other members from Prince Edward Island since my hon. friend called on me, but it would appear that it would be in his own interests to have the lists compiled in the same way as in the other provinces. It must do good, as far as it goes. There will be no extra work done that has not to be done in any event, and the line between the voter and the non-voter of the female sex will be clearly drawn and known before election day.

Mr. HUGHES: There is some expense that the candidates have to bear in this way. The official lists would be very useful if they wanted to send reading matter from Ottawa to their constituents, but for the sake of an election they are not so useful. If the Secretary of State cannot see his way clear, or the committee cannot see its way clear, to adopt the suggestion I have made and have no lists or enumerators at all, I have another suggestion to make. We want to have a fair election, and to take no advantage of anybody, Conservative or Liberal. Let us give the Liberals one-half of the enumerators.

Mr. MEIGHEN: I am sure if my hon. friend will consult the members from Saskatchewan and Alberta, he will find he is quite wrong about that. They will assure him that enumerators are needed, not as organizers at all.

Mr. HUGHES: I know that some of my colleagues from Prince Edward Island expect to get some advantage in that way.

Mr. MEIGHEN: They will be deceived.

Mr. HUGHES: They may be deceived. As I understand it, the Secretary of State would not think of the suggestion I have made that we should have one-half of the enumerators?

Mr. MEIGHEN: Neither side will have any. The enumerators will be officials of the country; they will not be officials of either side.

Mr. HUGHES: Who will recommend them?

Mr. MEIGHEN: The returning officer appoints them.

Mr. HUGHES: Who will the returning officer be?

Mr. MEIGHEN: His name has not been determined on yet. He will be a very fair man.

Mr. HUGHES: I suppose those things cannot be helped. I had occasion to say a few words on the conscription Bill when it was going through the House, and my idea was then, and it is still, that the best thing to do was to have a general election. I felt that would clear the air better than anything else. I made the statement that if the Government would hold a fair election, and was returned to power, whether I should be in Parliament or out of Parliament I would give them every assistance I could in carrying out the law. I would like to keep my promise in that respect, but it is coupled with a fair election. There will be no difficulty in having a fair election so far as our province is concerned, whatever difficulties may arise in the other provinces where, perhaps, people go to greater extremes. I feel satisfied that if we can have conditions there as we have had them for many years, it would conduce greatly to give our people the impression that we were having a fair election, but if new conditions are introduced, and we have such a system as they had some years ago in Saskatchewan and Alberta, which lent itself to improper conduct in regard to elections and provided facilities for crooked work, I fear our people will come to the conclusion that we are not likely to have a fair election, and may think that there will be some improper work carried on. However, I cannot do any more than present my views to the committee, and say that I wish very much the Secretary of State would consider whether my suggestion is or is not practicable. I know it would be possible to carry it out, and I believe it would be practicable to leave conditions as they are in that province.

Mr. MEIGHEN: There is the very great difficulty that it would leave to election day the determining of who votes as a woman voter, and who does not. I am afraid it would be a pretty big problem to deal with this on the day of the election. It is very different from what has taken place before.

Mr. BUREAU: Before six o'clock, the member for Bonaventure (Mr. Marcil) asked the Solicitor General if the wives, sisters and other female relatives of those who are British subjects and are serving in the French or the Belgian army would have the right to vote, the same as the wives and sisters of those who are serving in the British army. The Solicitor General said he would look into it.

Mr. MEIGHEN: The fact of the matter is that is the way the Bill read in the former draft I prepared, but I made up my mind it would be unfair and dangerous. I thought if it was in the Bill there would be very great objection from the other side of the House. I felt it would be unfair to include it, and I will tell you why. It would be too difficult to ascertain whether the allegation of a person who wanted to vote was correct or not. For example, how could we find out whether the man was serving in the Russian army? There are all manners of population in our western country, and the enumerator might, if he was the least unscrupulous, perhaps encourage some people to think they had brothers or relatives in the Russian army. How could that ever be checked? The same would apply to any other army. We can check them in our own army, or in the British army, and can get their numbers, but if we are going to open it to the Allied armies, I am afraid it might be subject to very great abuse.

Mr. BUREAU: I do not think it would be so difficult. All those British subjects who lived in the cities, such as Montreal, Quebec, or Three Rivers, for instance, are well known. The enumerators could get evidence from persons whose word could be taken or whose oath could be taken.

Mr. MEIGHEN: There would be cases of that kind, of course.

Mr. BUREAU: The French Consul, for instance, would know of those men who were British subjects and who enlisted in the French or Belgian armies. He would know exactly where those men are. I do not see any reason why the wives, daughters, widows and mothers of British subjects who are fighting in the ranks of the Allies should be deprived of their right to vote, if the relatives of other soldiers are granted that right.

Mr. MEIGHEN: There would be cases that could be ascertained. In my own constituency I would very much like to have this in the law, because there are many French reservists who have gone over from there. But if you open it to one you must open it to all. If you open it to those who claim they have relatives in the Russian army, the Japanese army, the Roumanian army, or any other army, how could you ever check the claims that will be made? I think it would be impracticable and dangerous.

Mr. BUREAU: The burden of proof would, of course, be upon the applicant.

If a woman could not establish to the satisfaction of the enumerator, or the judge, or whoever it is, that she is entitled to vote, of course she would be refused. It is better to refuse twenty than to refuse a whole class who are entitled to vote.

Mr. MEIGHEN: It would be just a matter of credibility, because the applicant would have no way of establishing it, in the majority of cases at all events, except by swearing to it and perhaps getting somebody else to swear to it. I do not think there would be any documentary evidence that could be produced in one case in a hundred.

Mr. BUREAU: There might not be any documentary evidence but they could accept the oaths of people who know them well. I do not think there could be anything like the conspiracy which the hon. gentleman mentions for the purpose of procuring the vote for a man. The list of the enumerator will show that his application for a vote is supported by the oaths of persons who are credible, who have known him for a long time and who believe that he has a right to vote, and the enumerator can thus satisfy himself that the application is correct.

Mr. PROULX: In the Military Service Act the Government is leaving the appointment of certain members of the local tribunals to the judges. I think it would be a good provision to be put in this Act that the enumerators shall be appointed by the judges. Where there are district judges, they know the people in the different localities very well and I think it would be safer that the enumerators should be appointed by them. They would not be as partisan as if they were appointed by the returning officer, who will be appointed by the Government. The returning officers are generally partisans who are recommended to the Government by the members supporting the Government or the defeated candidates or the persons who hold the patronage. The judges would be more impartial in the appointment of enumerators.

Mr. MEIGHEN: The hon. member (Mr. Proulx) has made rather a cruel attack on the fairness of the measure passed by his very distinguished leader and in force for many years. These officials have always been appointed by the Governor in Council or the returning officer. I do not see how the judges could very well come in there. The returning officer is the man who has charge of the constituency for election purposes. He has charge of the working out of the whole machinery of the Election Act applicable to the constituency. He divides it up into polls, and goes about from place to place and appoints enumerators. I do not think that as a rule the returning officers are partisan. I may be very innocent, but in two elections I contested, where I was the Opposition candidate, I did not think that there was any partisanship, and I do not see how there could have been to any great extent. I believe that these men, appointed to responsible positions, intend to observe their oath of office and to discharge the duties that the oath requires. It would be impracticable to bring the judiciary into this. We had better leave the judiciary out of something.

Mr. PROULX: These officers always belong to the party which has control of the appointments. The enumerators can do more to the detriment of the Opposition party, probably, than the returning officers. The returning officer only carries out the law.

9 p.m.

Mr. MEIGHEN: The hon. member for Saskatoon (Mr. McCraney), or the hon. member for Moosejaw (Mr. Knowles), can answer that better than I, but I think they would say "no" to the allegation of the hon. member for Prescott (Mr. Proulx).

Mr. McCRANEY: As the Secretary of State calls me as a witness, I would say that in my experience there has always been great difficulty in getting a returning officer. The duties are very arduous as compared with the remuneration. When a returning officer is willing to accept the office, a great part of the clerical work is thrown on the Government candidate. The returning officer does not know the riding as a rule. It is hardly as the Secretary of State has explained—that he lays out the polls and appoints the enumerators. The whole riding has to be laid out, and men who know the districts have to take the enumerations and they must be partisans, but the Government candidate has to assume the responsibility and see that there is a fair election. I was glad to hear the tribute the Secretary of State paid to the persons appointed by the late Liberal Administration.

Mr. McCREA: The hon. member for Parry Sound (Mr. Arthurs) a little while ago called the attention of the Government to the fact that there were 12,000 or more officers in England, men who had received commissions before they enlisted, who went

to the other side and then found there was no place in their rank for them. They are around London and other cities in England, having taken no part in the war and not having been at the front. The hon. member recommended that these men should either be sent to the front or sent home. How does the minister propose to deal with these gentlemen? Will the wives, mothers, sisters and fathers of these officers be given a vote, and, if so, on what ground? It is the intention to give votes to the female relatives of men who are wearing the khaki and drawing the King's pay, but who have not done anything and are not likely to do anything in connection with the war?

Mr. MEIGHEN: I think the hon. member (Mr. McCrea) very much over-states the phase of the subject that he is drawing attention to. I think he is multiplying by about ten.

Mr. McCREA: I am stating what the hon. member for Parry Sound said.

Mr. MEIGHEN: I think the hon. member said hundreds instead of thousands. All overseas forces are treated alike. It would be utterly impossible to discriminate between the merits of the men in the overseas forces for the purpose of the franchise just as it is impossible to discriminate between the individual merits of men in Canada. We had to take the class. The relatives of all overseas men will be treated alike.

Mr. KNOWLES: If it is possible to discriminate between people in Canada and those overseas, is it not quite possible to discriminate between those in England and those who are in the danger zone at the front?

Mr. MEIGHEN: We do that. We take all in England, of course, because they may go from England to France any day. It would be impossible to say that only the relatives of those in France should vote, because many of those in England may go to France any day at all.

Mr. KNOWLES: Many of them will go at no day at all.

Mr. MEIGHEN: I do not think that is very likely.

Mr. MURPHY: May I ask if the hon. gentleman's statement as to inability to discriminate between members of the expeditionary force serving overseas will apply to those who are engaged in the Canadian War Office—if that is what you call it—in London?

Mr. MEIGHEN: Any who are employed there, who are not members of the Canadian Expeditionary Force, would never be included in this Bill.

Mr. MURPHY: If they are members of the Canadian Expeditionary Force?

Mr. MEIGHEN: If they are members of tthe Canadian Expeditionary Force they will be included. I think a great many of them are returned soldiers who have seen service and are back in that office in London unfit for further military service.

Mr. KNOWLES: Does it apply to men who are still within the borders of Canada, who have not left, but who are liable to go at any time now?

Mr. MEIGHEN: Yes.

Mr. KNOWLES: I should think that even if the man has only got as far as Halifax, the sacrifice made by his wife or mother is as great as the sacrifice made by the wife or mother of the man who is twirling a cane and walking up and down the Strand or Picadilly, and who never goes any further.

Mr. MEIGHEN: There is a very great difference. There is no question as to the man in Canada. We know whether he has gone across the ocean or not. But it would be perfectly impracticable to work it out on the other basis, and say that the relatives of those who are still in England should have votes, because by the time the enumerator makes up the list these men might have gone to the front. That is not so in regard to the men in Canada. I would have no objection to giving a vote to the relatives of those who are still in Canada. But there might be an incentive for men to join the force in some capacity, not altogether too bona fide, in order to get the votes. If hon. gentlemen opposite want to enfranchise the female relatives of soldiers in Canada, we will consider it, but I really do not think they want it.

Mr. MURPHY: There was some evidence given before the Returned Soldiers' Committee by the Auditor General. Speaking of the investigation into that London office, he told us under oath that it would have saved the country thousands of dollars—I think he said hundreds of thousands—if they put a lot of the men out on the street and got them out of the way.

Mr. MEIGHEN: What office was that?

Mr. MURPHY: I do not know whether it was the Pay Office or what department. I would not like to say at present, but I can get the information for the minister. If there are men there who are not real soldiers, but are just playing at the game, I think the discrimination to which my hon. friend referred should properly be exercised. In order that the matter may come under the observation of my hon. friend, I will send him a copy of that evidence, because my recollection is that the matter was gone into rather in detail, and the statements of the Auditor General were confirmed by the hon. member for Calgary (Mr. R B. Bennett), who, I think, had some personal knowledge of the conditions existing in that office. That occurred only a few months ago.

Mr. MEIGHEN: I think the whole matter has been cured now. It can have no application to this Bill. This Bill deals with the members of the expeditionary force. If they were playing at soldiering at that time, they must now be in active service, to come under the provisions of this Bill.

Mr. MURPHY: When was it cured?

Mr. MEIGHEN: When we know there is a disease we immediately cure it.

Mr. MURPHY: Not in the case of the Ross rifle.

Mr. MEIGHEN: I have not seen the evidence to which the hon. member refers. I think this discussion will be dealt with better on some other occasion.

Mr. OLIVER: I think the hon. member for Sherbrooke (Mr. McCrea) is under an entire misapprehension as to the purpose of this Bill, or he would not have brought up the point he mentioned. He must know that this Bill is for the purpose of manufacturing votes for the Government, and he must surely know that the man who is drawing pay, without giving service, under the authority of this Government, is surely more certain to cast his vote for the Government, when the time comes, than the man who is compelled to render service, for which he is paid.

Mr. McKENZIE: As we are talking on the question of enumerators, I think this is perhaps as good a time as any to talk about the condition of things which this Act is going to introduce into my own province I think the Prime Minister will sympathize with me in the difficulty which I experience in regard to this Act. We have a most happy condition of things in regard to the list in Nova Scotia, and in every other province, I suppose, as well. There is no such officer as an enumerator in our province, and no disturbing elements about the list. About the first of January in each year a man begins to look around, and see that names are properly put on the list. About the 1st of April, the sheriff's court is through with them, and the list is handed in to the county clerk, certified by the sheriff, and a copy of that list is sent to the Clerk of the Crown in Chancery. That is done every year in every county in Nova Scotia. The machinery runs along smoothly. The revisers are appointed by the county council, and the town councils and city councils look after the lists. Nobody complains, and everybody gets his name on the list if he has a right to have it there; and if a name gets on the list when it has no right to be there, it is taken off. When it comes to election time, the returning officer gets this list from the Clerk of the Crown in Chancery at Ottawa. and that is the end of it; nobody interferes with it. Now we are up against a condition of things that we do not know really where we are. I cannot gather from this Bill when the list is to be completed, or whether a complete list is to go to the returning officer who is appointed, say, for my own county of North Cape Breton and Victoria. The Government appoints a returning officer for the county. I do not know where he is going to get his complete list. I find some machinery by which twenty or thirty people will go round the county making lists. I find nothing in this Act providing when they are to begin, or what kind of system is to be followed as to where they shall sit, or how they shall conduct the business, or what opportunity one has for getting a name off or on. I must say to the Prime Minister and the Secretary of State that it is introducing into the province of Nova Scotia a very disturbing element indeed, and one which is capable of creating a lot of confusion. If there is any way by which the present machinery of making the lists can be utilized in Nova Scotia, I am sure it would satisfy the people very much better than this measure. The present officials are not partisan. Whatever the complexion of the council may be in Nova Scotia, whether there is a majority one way or the other, each Councillor has always been permitted, so far as I know, to name his own officers. If there is a Tory councillor for the district, as a rule he has Tory officers, and if there is a Liberal councillor, although there might be a Tory majority in the county, he gets his own officer.

Mr. MEIGHEN: How is the sheriff appointed?

Mr. McKENZIE: He is appointed by the provincial government, I never heard any complaint as to him. The county officials have been men of high standing, and I have never heard any complaint about them. I think the same is true of every sheriff in Nova Scotia. I appeal to the Prime Minister in this matter, and I tell him that if the machinery now in vogue in Nova Scotia for looking after the lists were utilized, every one would know where to go, and how the thing was to be done, and it would work out, I think, very much better. As it stands, I must admit, I do not know where it begins or where it ends. At present the lists are to be fixed and tinkered with right down to election day, which must necessarily be unsatisfactory to us who are unaccustomed and unacquainted with anything of that kind.

Mr. NESBITT: I ask the Secretary of State if I am right in thinking that in 33 A, the words "who is serving or who has served without Canada" will include those that have been sent home and been honourably discharged?

Mr. MEIGHEN: Oh, yes.

Sir ROBERT BORDEN: In regard to what the member for North Cape Breton (Mr. McKenzie) has said, I am afraid that the members on this side of the House are not quite so well pleased with the lists in Nova Scotia as he is. I am bound to say that, as far as my own county is concerned, Donald Archibald, the sheriff who acted as returning officer in many of the elections and who was final arbiter on the lists, was as fair a man as could be found in Canada, and I have not a word to say against him. As far as I know, the same is true of the present occupant of the office. But I have had reports from gentlemen on this side of the House in regard to some other sheriffs that are not precisely of the same tenor. One hon. gentleman has asserted to me that 192 names were dropped from the lists in his county by the sheriff without his knowledge and after it was supposed that the lists had all been settled. He gave me pretty definite information as to that. My hon. friend knows that for many years past there has been an effort in Nova Scotia to obtain judicial revision of the lists, but that demand has not yet been complied with. I am quite sure, therefore, that the view entertained by members on this side of the House in regard to the condition of the lists in Nova Scotia is not quite the same as that which has been expressed by my hon. friend. However, so far as the operation of this Bill is concerned, I do not think that there will be any difficulty. The enumerators will commence work as soon as they are appointed, and their work must be completed under the terms of the Bill as it is at present, at least ten days before election day.

Mr. McKENZIE: How are they to go on with their work? Are they to have a court, sitting in some particular place?

Sir ROBERT BORDEN: They go on precisely in the same way as they have gone on for the last twelve years in Alberta and Saskatchewan. The provisions of this Bill so far as enumerators are concerned are based on the provisions of the law as it has existed in those provinces. The only difference is that this Bill provides certain safeguards which have not been enforced in Alberta and Saskatchewan during the period of twelve years to which I have referred.

Sir WILFRID LAURIER: In Alberta and Saskatchewan there are no lists, but in the other provinces for which we are now preparing new machinery they have lists—in Ontario, Quebec, Nova Scotia and New Brunswick. We are giving the enumerators power to recast those lists. What is the object of that? So far as I can see, it is simply, on the one hand, to eliminate the names of those who, according to this Bill, should not be on the lists because of their being of foreign origin; and, on the other hand, to place upon the lists the names of female voters who, under this legislation, will have the right to vote as relatives of soldiers. The enumerators take off names here and put on names there, but as a result of their work there is no official decision; the vote can be challenged at the poll and it is provided that a judicial authority shall afterwards determine whether or not the name was properly put on or taken off the list. If the work of the enumerators settles nothing, what is the use of having the work done? Let the lists be taken as they are. A man goes to the poll to vote; objection is taken to him on the ground that he is of alien enemy birth. If he persists in his claim to the right to vote, he casts his ballot and the question whether or not he had the right to vote will be decided after the election by judicial authority. What is the use of having all this machinery? The great advantage of the lists in all the provinces is that the right

to the vote is settled by the presence of the man's name on the list; no one can be challenged if his name is on the list. It seems to me that this work is of absolutely no use.

Sir ROBERT BORDEN: It is true that there were no lists in Alberta and Saskatchewan; therefore, lists had to be made. It is true, also, that in various provinces of Canada there are no complete lists—

Sir WILFRID LAURIER: Yes there are.

Sir ROBERT BORDEN: There are no complete lists for the purposes of this Act, because names must be added and names must be struck off. It is necessary, therefore, to make new lists. If we had followed in their entirety the provisions of the Act which my hon. friend thought was good enough for Alberta and Saskatchewan for twelve years, there might be some ground for complaint. As I understand the law of that province, a man could obtain the right to vote by making an affidavit; there was no appeal against that, and no remedy in respect of it afterwards.

Sir WILFRID LAURIER: The same as it will be here.

Sir ROBERT BORDEN: The man went on the list; he disappeared the next day; no one could find him; there was no remedy. Gentlemen from the provinces of Alberta and Saskatchewan have pointed out that the enumerator there was in touch with one candidate and not in touch with another, the result being obvious. If we had adopted the method that my right hon. friend thought was a fair method for those two provinces for 12 years, I admit that we might be subject to some animadversion. But we have not done that. We have provided in this Bill that the vote of any man whose name gets upon the list through his making an affidavit may be afterwards challenged. Any person who goes on in the regular way is subject to having his right to vote challenged afterwards. So that there is, in effect, a judicial revision of the lists—that revision, if any is necessary, is to take place after, not before, the voter has deposited his ballot. The safeguard is the same in one case as in the other, and that safeguard was absolutely wanting in the provisions of the Act that my hon. friend kept in force in Saskatchewan for twelve years.

Sir WILFRID LAURIER: The Act with regard to Saskatchewan and Alberta was framed in 1905, when the provinces were created. We took then the provisions that we found in the existing law. We took them as they were. We could do nothing else. There could be no provincial list, because there was no province.

Sir ROBERT BORDEN: Why could my right hon. friend not have provided a judicial revision in Alberta and Saskatchewan?

Sir WILFRID LAURIER: I am not aware that there has been any complaint in that regard. There may have been. While I contend that everything we did was right, we may have made mistakes. Our regime, however, was so good at all events, that the only complaint that was made against it was that we remained in power too long, and that is the reason we were defeated. We did too well. The great difference between the law as it exists to-day and the law that will exist after this Bill passes is that, under the law as it is to-day, the lists which are made are final. The lists are revised by a judicial authority, and then after a man's name goes on the list, it is no longer challenged.

Mr. CROTHERS: It can be challenged at the poll.

Sir WILFRID LAURIER: The list is revised by the judicial authority, and his decision is final.

Mr. CROTHERS: If a man is asked on election day to take an oath, he has to do so.

Sir WILFRID LAURIER: No, he cannot be asked to do that. When the judge is revising the lists, a man may be disqualified, but after his name has been put on the list, there is no challenge; the matter is fixed finally. This Bill is very complicated, but if I understand it aright, the list will be made by the enumerator. That officer will take the list which is made to-day, which would be final and the present law, and will strike off names and add on names, but the question whether those names have been properly stricken off or added remains to be decided after the vote has been taken. If that is to be the law, why not leave the lists just as they are? Suppose a man's name is put upon the list by an enumerator, and it so happens that he was born in an enemy country. He comes to the poll and is challenged. He may claim that he has a right to vote and may ask for a certificate from the enumerator. The enumerator will give him a certificate; his name will go on the list, and his vote will be taken subject to its being accepted or rejected afterwards by the judge. All

this revision is of no benefit. You will have no saving of time or expense; in fact, you will have all the trouble and expense of the enumeration to reach the same conclusion to which you can attain to-day under the law as it is.

Mr. MEIGHEN: the point is just this, that the work is 90 or 95 per cent done instead of the judge having to do it afterwards. If the right hon. gentleman's reasoning was correct, we might as well never have a list and simply have a challenge on election day. That would mean that the judges of Canada would have to revise 1,750,000 votes, whereas by having lists made up by the enumerators as carefully as their abilities can do it, you reduce to a mere fraction of one per cent the work that a judge would have to do.

Mr. A. K. MACLEAN: What section are we at?

Mr. MEIGHEN: Paragraph (h), section 42, at the bottom of page 3.

Mr. A. K. MACLEAN: I did not understand that the former clause was passed.

Mr. MEIGHEN: We are not passing anything; we are passing from one to another.

Mr. GRAHAM: They are touching them all.

Mr. OLIVER: In regard to the procedure in Alberta, at one time the procedure embodied in this measure was partially followed in that province. The provision was made that the man whose name was not on the list could swear his vote on, and that vote was subject to subsequent adjudication before a court.

Mr. MEIGHEN: That is in the provincial election only.

Mr. OLIVER: Yes. It was found in practice, if my memory is correct, that this resulted in other than the public interest, and instead of making the vote, after being cast, subject to adjudication, as to its being counted, it was considered to be sufficient that the man who attempted to vote should take an oath thereby rendering himself personally liable to a penalty if he had exercised the right improperly. Experience showed, in the judgment of the authorities there, that it was not in the public interest that the validity of the vote itself should be the subject of judicial investigation. It was considered that the penalty for taking a false oath was a sufficient restraint to answer the requirements of the public, although theoretically, of course, it was not an altogether equitable, final decision. This Bill goes fufrther and provides for the tying up of votes of men whose names are put on the list by the enumerator.

Sir ROBERT BORDEN: Would my hon. friend suggest that we had better have the proposed judicial revision eliminated from this Bill and make it precisely as it is now in Saskatchewan and Alberta?

Mr. OLIVER: I do not wish to take the responsibility of introducing the legislation that my hon. friend sees fit to introduce.

Sir ROBERT BORDEN: My hon. friend is trying to give suggestions.

Mr. OLIVER: The Secretary of State has laid emphasis on the statement that he is following the conditions in Alberta and Saskatchewan.

Sir ROBERT BORDEN: But providing safeguards.

Mr. OLIVER: I am pointing out that, if I understand the matter correctly, he is following conditions as they have been, but abandoned in Saskatchewan and Alberta for reasons that prevail there but that may not be valid in other parts of the country. I am only desirous that there shall not be a misunderstanding on the part of the committee as to the facts of the case, and that the committee may not be impressed with the idea that the provisions of the Bill are desirable in application throughout Canada because it has been found necessary, owing to special circumstances, to apply them as they are applied in Alberta and Saskatchewan. What did occur in Alberta when the principle that is contained in this Bill was embodied in the provincial law was this: Ballots were tied up vexatiously, for the purpose of improperly influencing the election in this way: A number of votes would be challenged, and they would be tied up. They would not be counted at the general count. Then there would have to be a semi-judicial investigation as to the validity of those votes, and there is always the possibility of manipulating the evidence that might be brought to bear, and if the first count seemed to be to some extent indecisive, then the election had to be fought all over again in the courts in regard to those tied ballots. It was not because the principle was not theoretically sound. The principle was,theoretically,absolutely sound, but in practice it did not work out properly, and, if I understand the matter correctly, the authorities decided rather to take the chances on the occasional count of a vote that was not valid than to prejudice

the conclusion of the whole election by reason of dilatory legal proceedings.

Sir ROBERT BORDEN: I imagine my hon. friend has a wider experience as to the effect of such provisions than any other member of this House, and naturally any suggestion that comes from him based upon his long experience are entitled to very careful consideration. I understand him to state as a result of that experience that the system of judicial revision having been tried, and the system without such judicial revision having been also tried for a number of years, it was found that the latter system was on the whole the more satisfactory of the two.

Mr. OLIVER: The lesser of two evils.

Sir ROBERT BORDEN: And that for the reason which he states very forcibly, namely, that the uncertainty, the delay and inconvenience attending a judicial revision rather outweigh any danger which might result from the lack of such judicial revision. I shall take his view into very careful consideration, as there is a great deal of force in what he suggests, and his suggestion is based upon a very long experience of both systems. Perhaps the matter might be allowed to stand over for the present, and I will confer with the Secretary of State in regard to it.

Mr. OLIVER: I only wished to inform the committee as to the actual facts of the case, and I was led to do so by what I heard the leader of the Opposition say. I am not sufficiently familiar with the Act to know whether I took the right point or not, but I thought that where provincial lists are adopted, and insofar as they are adopted, it would not be an improvement at any rate to provide for any tying of ballots on account of challenge of those votes which were on a fixed list.

Mr. MEIGHEN: In so far as the lists are adopted, there is no tying of ballots at all. It is in so far as the lists are changed that there is a tying of ballots.

Mr. OLIVER: But not the fixed lists?

Mr. MEIGHEN: No.

Mr. GRAHAM: I want to make sure that I understand this Bill correctly as it applies to the older provinces, particularly Ontario. The list which will be adopted in the province of Ontario, subject to change by reason of this Act, will be that list which was finally revised in the autumn of 1916. The method of that revision is well known. The list is prepared from the assessment roll, and finally revised on appeal by the county judge, except in cities, where they have registration. Do I understand that that is to be the basis of the list in Ontario, subject to the changes made by the enumerator owing to the provisions of this Act? Voters who are disfranchised under this Act will have their names removed from that list.

Sir ROBERT BORDEN: There will be changes resulting from both enfranchisement and disqualification.

Mr. GRAHAM: And the enumerator will have to add to the list the new voters who are enfranchised by this Act? As I understand the proposition of the Government, so far as the list of 1916 as finally revised in Ontario is concerned, there will be no rejection of ballots, except by the ordinary form of challenge. Under ordinary conditions the scrutineer challenges a vote for any cause. If the voter takes the oath prescribed by law the vote is counted. Under the present law that vote will still be counted. So far as new votes are concerned, which are to be added by the enumerator, if objection is taken to any vote it is placed in a separate receptacle and not counted, except under proceedings which may become necessary on account of the closeness of the vote. I imagine that what my hon. friend from Edmonton (Mr. Oliver) had in his mind was that the tied ballot would apply to the fixed list as well, but that is not the case. There is a good deal to be said, however, for his contention as to the merits of the two methods. Whether more will be gained or lost by placing those challenged ballots in a separate receptacle, is a question for the committee and the Government to consider very seriously.

Sir ROBERT BORDEN: There are advantages and disadvantages in both methods.

Mr. GRAHAM: There is another point in connection with clause 48. As I understand it, the voters' list as finally prepared by the enumerators will not be posted, in Ontario, until ten days before polling day. In the county of South Renfrew, for instance, ten days would not give the candidate an opportunity of any practical value of having in his possession a voters' list, which is a very necessary thing for a candidate to have. In a constituency that is over a hundred miles long, and where the electors, particularly in winter time, can only be reached by team, it would be impossible to make any use of the voters' list if it were not posted for a longer period

than ten days before polling day. Even in a small constituency it would be very difficult to make practical use of it in such a short time. Of course, the candidate will have in his possession the list of 1916 as finally revised except for the changes to be made by the enumerator, but the names of the women voters who are to be added will not be in his possession, and those are the ones about which he will show a great deal of solicitude, and have probably little or no information.

Sir ROBERT BORDEN: I would point out that the similar provisions in force in Alberta and Saskatchewan provide for only eight days before polling day, and that in a country which some years ago was very sparsely settled, and is not as thickly populated to-day probably, as the portion of Ontario to which my hon. friend refers.

Mr. NESBITT: It is eight days before nomination day.

Sir ROBERT BORDEN: No, eight days before election day.

Mr. NESBITT: The old Act says eight days before nomination day.

Sir ROBERT BORDEN: In the Alberta and Saskatchewan Acts it is eight days before election day, and if their Acts would work satisfactorily under conditions such as I have described, it would seem to me there would hardly be the difficulties that my hon. friend anticipates in the county of Renfrew or in any other county in the province of Ontario. However, the Secretary of State has already said in reply to the hon. member for Saskatoon that we will consider extending that period of ten days, and we are going to consider it.

Mr. GRAHAM: I have no knowledge of conditions in Saskatchewan and Alberta, but I take it for granted that practically every resident there would have a vote, so that a candidate travelling over a constituency out there would not be likely to miss many voters.

But with this new addition of the women voters the situation will be a little different. You will not be in a position to know, unless you inquire intimately, whether they have relatives at the front. The situation is different from what it would be if you were dealing with men living in the vicinity who you would take it for granted, had the right to vote.

Mr. MEIGHEN: There is one matter I want to make clear, because I am very anxious that there should not be any mistake whatever in regard to the meaning of this law, and I invite the attention of the hon. member for Edmonton to the point. When I stated to him and to the hon. member for South Renfrew (Mr. Graham) that there were no tied ballots in relation to the lists that are not adopted and fixed, but the tied ballot appertained to the work of the enumerator only, that is true in spirit, but it is not absolutely accurate. In this sense: all the enumerator can do is to add the names of women who are entitled to vote. All he can strike off are those who should be struck off for alienage or as conscientious objectors. Suppose he should strike off a name saying that the party was a conscientious objector, and if that were not true the man whose name was so struck off, if he was on the original list, could go and vote. Then the ballot would go into an envelope and become tied; so that, strictly speaking, a man on the list might get into the tied ballot list.

Mr. GRAHAM: The work of the enumerator is subject to the tied ballot system?

Mr. MEIGHEN: There is nothing reviewed by the judge except the work of the enumerator. A man should not be on the list, let us say, because he has moved away, but the enumerator cannot strike his name off for that reason, and even if he does the man can vote.

Mr. McKENZIE: As it is at present in our province, if you are going to move to have a name struck off the list, there is one day in the year on which it can be done and that is the fifth day of March, the day on which the revising board meets. You must serve the man with a notice that on that day you are going to move before the court of revision to have his name struck off. In this case the enumerator has the power of the revising board; he has the power to strike a name off. What opportunity do you give any person to be heard, and upon what facts does this enumerator strike a name or names off?

Mr. MEIGHEN: He gets as good evidence as he can get, and he acts on that. But the party does not need to appeal, because all he has to do is to go and vote. He can make affidavit that he is entitled to a certificate of refusal, and he votes.

Mr. McKENZIE: But his vote is not counted.

Mr. MEIGHEN: It is counted, if the judge finds he has the right to vote.

Mr. CARVELL: Suppose a hundred, or two hundred, or three hundred names were struck off the list by the enumerator—

Mr. MEIGHEN: There are only 300 on the list.

Mr. CARVELL: I am speaking of the electoral district.

Mr. MEIGHEN: You have to consider the polling division as the unit.

Mr. CARVELL: Say there should be 300 of these men struck off in an ordinary constituency. I want to tell you that if you had to deal with some of the people we have to deal with in the Maritime Provinces, you would know how easily it could be done. These 300 votes would not be counted, they would be placed in envelopes, and would finally reach the judge. Think what a burden that would impose upon the candidate, to bring those 300 witnesses in order to prove they are qualified voters. I confess I never had any experience in preparing lists by enumerators as hon. gentlemen in this House from the West have had, and they would know very much more about it than I do. At the same time, it seems to me it makes the enumerator practically a dictator. That is so repugnant to the ideas we have always had in the East in regard to the preparation of voters' lists, that I view it with the greatest alarm. Think of a man, who is always a political supporter of course, being chosen to go around the country and make up a list of the female voters, and who would also be allowed to strike from the list the names of any voters who are aliens, or former aliens, or conscientious objectors. So far as the Maritime Provinces are concerned, I think the number of the aliens and conscientious objectors is practically nil. This enumerator starts to make out a list of the female voters. There seems to be practically no appeal from his decision. He works in the dark, or at night, and anywhere he has a mind to, and strikes off practically whomever he pleases. All we know is that ten days before the election one of these lists is put up in the post office, and that the enumerator is to be at some place for two hours each day after that to listen to objections. But suppose he will not listen to them? It seems to me this work should be done by the same officials who are making up the lists at the present time, at least in the provinces east of the Great Lakes. Almost invariably, these enumerators are representative of both political parties. In the province of New Brunswick you will find once in a while a board composed altogether of Liberals or altogether of Conservatives, but that is a very rare occurrence. Each party has a chance to be heard. Before a man's name is removed he must have notice, and after the list is made it is posted up and notice given that at a certain time the board will meet to revise it. I should think some arrangement of that sort might be arrived at. They have had this system of enumerators in the West, but we have never had it in the East, and I can see all sorts of trouble looming up. I would like the Government to consider if there is not some way of utilizing the machinery already existing for the preparation of those lists.

Mr. A. K. MACLEAN: I would like to ask the Secretary of State if subsection 2 so numbered, at the top of page 4, refers to the provinces of Alberta and Saskatchewan alone.

Mr. MEIGHEN: The four western provinces and Prince Edward Island. Wherever the enumerator makes a whole list, he uses as a basis any information he can get.

Mr. A. K. MACLEAN: If the minister had stated that before, I think it would have cleared up the matter to a great many gentlemen on this side. It would be a very unfair provision to apply in my own province at least.

Sir ROBERT BORDEN: Why?

Mr. A. K. MACLEAN: It would practically do away with the provincial list. In section 65 A it is provided that the list in force for provincial purposes shall be adopted by the enumerator. But under subsection 2 the enumerator is given power to make an entirely new list. I would make a suggestion. I understood from the Secretary of State this afternoon that he had the manuscript in typewritten fo m of what will be Part II, that is, he has all the sections with the amendments proposed in this Bill written in. Would it not be possible to send that to the printer immediately and have it back perhaps some time to-morrow. It is almost impossible to understand the Bill as it is, and one's time is taken up in trying to read it, leaving very little to consider the principle of the Bill or make suggestions. It is most confusing. I do not think it is a fair way to put a Bill before the committee. Usually we have marginal notes in Bills, which are very helpful. For instance, if subsection 2 on page 4 referred to the fact that it was applicable to British Columbia, Alberta, Saskatchewan and Manitoba, it

would have helped a great many of us on this side. I do not believe we can make much progress with the Bill in its present form. It might be a very simple affair and perhaps we could dispose of it very quickly if it were in some better shape. This is the most horrible Bill that I ever saw before Parliament.

Mr. CARVELL: I feel very much as my hon. friend does. I had to leave last Friday and I took a copy of the Bill with me. I thought I would have plenty of time on the way down to digest it. I might as well have been reading a Latin grammar that I had never seen as to read that Bill. It was not Latin, it was Greek, to me.

Sir ROBERT BORDEN: It would have been perfectly plain to my hon. friend if he had had a copy of the Dominions Elections Act with him.

Mr. CARVELL: I did not have a copy of it. If I had had half a day to myself and a copy of the election law, I might have arrived at some conclusion as to what the Bill meant.

Sir ROBERT BORDEN: I think my hon. friend will find that it is not as difficult or complicated as he imagines, when he grasps the basic idea of it, which is that the polling subdivision is the unit for the preparation of the lists in Alberta and Saskatchewan. That law is the basis of this Bill. They adopted the principle in the Act of 1905, based upon a previous Act, that the polling subdivision should be the unit for the preparation of the lists. It rather impressed me with its simplicity, and I do not think it will be difficult to understand this Bill if we keep that idea in mind.

Mr. MACLEAN: Is it not possible to carry out my suggestion about having the Bill printed?

Mr. MEIGHEN: It will be possible. I did not want, first of all, to go to the expense, and, secondly, the delay, of printing a large number of copies until we knew what would be its final form.

Mr. A. K. MACLEAN: Only Part II would need to be printed.

Mr. MEIGHEN: That would not be complete, because Part III is essential to an understanding of the effect of Part II. I intend to have that printed, and indeed we could start to-night and print it, but if we did we would likely have to amend it substantially before it got through committee. I know that the two hon. gentlemen who have spoken will have no difficulty with a copy of the Election Act before them. I could get on without a copy of the Election Act at all. Certainly, the Bill itself is not very likely to have much meaning without the Election Act read with it.

Mr. A. K. MACLEAN: Some of us on this side of the House, with a little labour, could understand the Bill, but a great number would have difficulty in even understanding it. It is only right that they should have some proper understanding of the Bill before they are asked to consider it.

Mr. ROSS: I would like to back up the suggestion made by the hon. member for Carleton (Mr. Carvell) with regard to the machinery in connection with this Act. It is all very well for the Prime
10 p.m. Minister to say that it is based on the polling subdivision. Let me state what that would mean, and for the purposes of my illustration I will take the riding of West Middlesex in which there are eighty polling subdivisions. It means that you will have to appoint eighty enumerators in that riding, and that they will have to sit for ten days before polling day to prepare these lists. That is going to put an immense expense upon the country. In the 234 ridings, supposing there are eighty subdivisions in each and you have an enumerator for each polling subdivision, the expense is going to be very heavy. I think it would simplify matters if this provision of the Act were reversed. The suggestion made by the hon. member for Carleton is sensible and practical. He says: Why not use the present machinery? Speaking of Ontario particularly, this work might be left to the township and municipal clerks in each municipality who have the preparation of the lists in charge.

Mr. A. K. MACLEAN: That is not applicable to the Maritime Provinces.

Mr. ROSS: I am speaking of Ontario. There is no reason why the Act should not be made applicable to Ontario if a more sensible and less expensive method is proposed than the one suggested. In rural and town municipalities—it may not apply to cities—why should not the township and municipal clerks prepare these lists, and, during the ten days when the enumerator sits, why should not the township clerk sit at the township hall and revise the lists in the ordinary way? He is more familiar with the lists than any other person in the county. In West Middlesex there are sixteen municipalities, and sixteen township clerks would do the work. Under the sys-

tem suggested by the Secretary of State you will have to appoint eighty or ninety enumerators who are not familiar with the lists or with the people as the township clerks are. You save a great deal of expense in not having to appoint all these enumerators, you have the lists perfected, and on election day one man, the deputy returning officer, will do all the work that you are asking the enumerators to do under this Bill. That would simplify the matter very much, and you would be able to carry out the spirit of the Bill much more intelligently and much less expensively than if you adopt the plan suggested by the Secretary of State. That hon. gentleman said a moment ago that the enumerator would only have the power to add the names of the female relatives of soldiers and strike off the names of people of alien birth and conscientious objectors. He said that he would have no right to strike off a non-resident if he came back to vote. Are we going to have non-resident voters under this Act? If a man has gone from West Middlesex to Carleton, say, and is on the voters' lists, although he is living in Carleton, will he be allowed to come back and vote?

Mr. MEIGHEN: Yes, the law stands in that regard as it was if no Act were passed.

Mr. ROSS: Under the present law he could not vote at all.

Mr. MEIGHEN: Then, if he could not vote at all, he could not vote under this.

Mr. ROSS: I understood the hon. gentleman to say that that man could come back to vote.

Mr. MEIGHEN: I gave that as an illustration. If a man on the list in Ontario cannot, by virtue of the Ontario law vote, because of being a non-resident, although he is on the list, he cannot vote under this Act. I did not know that. If that is the case my illustration has not any force. I will give another. Suppose that the enumerator says that a man is not of age.

Mr. ROSS: He could not do that.

Mr. MEIGHEN: He could not do that. That man will go on and vote. It does not enable a non-resident to vote if, according to the Ontario law, he cannot vote.

Mr. ROSS: I would like the Secretary of State to consider the suggestion I made because I think it is far more practicable than the plan proposed.

Mr. EDWARDS: In suggesting that the township clerks take the place of the enumerators who will be appointed for each polling subdivision does my hon. friend (Mr. Ross) propose that the township clerk should go to each polling subdivision within his township and ascertain the names of the women who may be added under this Act?

Mr. ROSS: I do not see any reason why he could not. No man is more familiar with that township, and all the persons residing in it, than he is, and if you have, as a protection to the voter, a further provision that the township clerk shall sit in the town for ten days, to have names added to the list or names struck off, I think you have every protection to the voter.

Mr. EDWARDS: There would not be very much saved, in the matter of expense, if the township clerk had to go around and do the work of the men who were appointed at these various polling divisions to attend to the work. There is another feature of this question; my hon. friend must remember that each township clerk is, first of all, a servant of the township. It might be that under this Act he would be required to be present at a certain time to investigate conditions at some polling division and at the same time the township council might require his services along some other line. The township is entitled to his services first. The advantage of appointing an enumerator at each poll, in preference to appointing any one man who lives in some particular corner of the municipality, is obvious. Some one man in each polling division would be better acquainted with all the people in that polling division than an outside man could possibly be. I do not think the township clerk of any municipality would know what men were entitled to be placed on the list under this Act in every corner of the municipality. He might know most of them; he might possibly know more than any other one man would, but I do not think he could possibly be as well acquainted with each polling division as some person selected from that polling division.

Mr. CARVELL: I am not much concerned about whether we nominate the township clerk, on account of the saving of expense, although I think there is something in that, but I should like to see some public official appointed so that the suspicion of political partiality in the matter will be removed. The township clerk in Ontario has something to do with the preparation of the list. If you take the revising officer, or the revising board as we

call it in New Brunswick, which prepares the list, or if you take the secretary treasurer in Nova Scotia who, I understand, prepares the list subject to supervision, you give it a final flavour. The people for generations, in the old portions of Canada, have been used to having their lists prepared by municipal authority, and while they have their own troubles, and probably some unfairness, yet the system works out very well. They know how to meet one another and how to argue these matters, and we get a pretty good list, as a rule. But I view with a great deal of suspicion, in eastern Ontario, the provision by which the Government is going to appoint its own political friends. They will start out to make a list, and I cannot see, after reading the Bill over hurriedly, any provision by which any person can appeal to that man and have a name added or a name taken off. He can go to them, but there is no provision for making an affidavit. You can go to a man and say: "Here is a certain woman who has a son at the front," and the official may say: "No, she has not a son at the front; he is at Halifax, and I will not put the name on." What is she going to do?

Mr. MEIGHEN: Vote.

Mr. CARVELL: Yes, but her vote will not be counted. She has to go before a judge later on.

Mr. MEIGHEN: But supposing the system in Ontario were adopted, and you had to go to the judge first, and have the name put on, you would be put to the same expense as in the other case.

Mr. CARVELL: No. The local revision is all done within a very small compass. You can get the affidavits of the proper parties, and prove to the municipal authorities that the party is or is not enitled to be placed on the list, and you make your revision beforehand at practically no expense, because it is all done locally in each municipality—we call them parishes in the East, or polling districts. But when you force them to vote under protest you call it a tied vote. Then the court meets, and you bring all those people to the shiretown. In my constituency I might bring people some seventy-five miles to prove whether they had a right to be on the voters' list. I do not know whether my hon. friend has appreciated what this thing means. If you change this provision, so that the municipal authorities would re-revise the list, or add to the revised list, it would be an improvement. If you have municipal authorities in my province, or in any province in eastern Canada, who have the jurisdiction and the right to make the list of male voters, surely you could be able to hand over to the same authorities the power to make the list of female voters. You are introducing something we never heard of before in eastern Canada, and I can see no end of trouble and misunderstanding, and there would be no end of mistakes. An hon. member near me suggests that they will pick out the female voters who will vote the right way. I am not so very much afraid of that in the East, because people are known to one another, and if the different political organizations take hold of the thing and work hard enough, and they have an enumerator who is not too violent a partisan, you may get a fair list. But you have always the suspicion that it is not straight, and you may get hold of a political partisan—and I am sorry to say we have in the East, on both sides of the fence, men who will do things you can hardly imagine—and if you send a man like that around making up the lists by himself, without any one having the right to go to him, it will not be fair. He makes up his list, he is the man to whom you must appeal, and he may say, "I will change it," or "I will not change it." It seems to me you will have all kinds of trouble and unfairness under that system, whereas if the old machinery were adopted people will know what they are doing. The hon. member for North Cape Breton (Mr. McKenzie) referred to subsection 2 which provides that the enumerator has the right to strike a name from the list on the ground that the party was a former alien or a conscientious objector. My friend might say, "Oh, well, if he strikes a man off improperly the man still has the right to go to the tribunal and make an affidavit. But this is so foreign to our ideas down East in regard to removing names from the voters' list that I cannot accept it for a moment. We look upon it as an outrage to strike a man's name from the voters' list, unless you give him notice.

Surely a man ought to have the right to protect himself. He ought to have the right to say: I am not a German; I am not an Austrian. He ought to have the right to say: I am a person of Austrian birth, but I was naturalized sixteen years ago. Under this Bill you give the political friends of the Government the right to re-

move the name of that man from the list, and he has no alternative but that of swearing his vote. Later he may have to travel fifty or seventy-five miles in order that he may satisfy a judge that he had the right to vote.

Mr. A. K. MACLEAN: Does this Bill provide that persons qualified to vote under the Military Voters' Act shall have their names added to the list by enumerators?

Mr. MEIGHEN: No.

Mr. A. K. MACLEAN: The names of a great number of such are not on the roll.

Mr. MEIGHEN: If a man qualifies under the ordinary civil law, he has the right to go on the list even though he is a returned soldier. But if he does he can vote only once; the Military Voters' Act provides that.

Mr. A. K. MACLEAN: There will be a large number of soldiers in Canada who are not registered but who will be entitled to vote by simply coming to the poll and taking the oath.

Mr. MEIGHEN: Such men could not get on the list in Ontario, Nova Scotia, New Brunswick or Quebec on that ground, because the Bill provides that only female relatives of soldiers can get on.

Mr. A. K. MACLEAN: Most of the persons whose names will be removed from the electoral lists by reason of alienage will be found in the western provinces. Why should their names not remain on the lists and the oath be put to them when they come to vote? If they swear that they were qualified prior to 1902, they will be entitled to a vote. If anybody is of opinion that they were not naturalized prior to that date, they may be required to take the oath; if they decline to take the oath they lose the vote. Outside villages or any incorporated town or city in my constituency I should be willing to let the wives, mothers and sisters of soldiers vote without their names being on the lists. They would be well known in the several communities in which they resided, and if an oath were inserted in the Act which could be administered to those asking for the right to vote, that would cover the case. In larger places lists could be made.

Mr. MEIGHEN: On the same principle you might as well not have a list at all. If you do things that way, the whole election will have to be revised by the judges. Good list-making involves this: as much work as possible should be done before the contest; everything that can be finally decided should be decided before the contest. Such as cannot be agreed upon is subjected to judicial decision; but let us not leave everything to judicial decision. If every woman could vote by merely swearing that she was the relative of a soldier—and she might so swear quite honestly—thousands of votes might be polled that should not be polled at all.

Mr. A. K. MACLEAN: My suggestion, of course, is applicable only to rural districts, where it would be almost impossible for any woman to claim improperly the suffrage under this Act.

Mr. MEIGHEN: It is possible to conceive of an enumerator who would defy the obvious rights of a person who should be on the list, but such an enumerator would be notoriously crooked and notoriously stupid. Suppose the enumerator declines to put on Mrs. Smith whose son, everybody knows, is at the front. He could not do more harm to the candidate whom he is supposed to favour than he does by taking that course. Whenever that becomes known the people begin to feel that they had better vote the other way. It arouses disgust at once.

Mr. CARVELL: That is not the way it is done down East. They manipulate the votes not by refusing to put a man on who is entitled to be registered, but by putting on men who are not entitled to be registered. That is where the difficulty comes in.

Mr. MEIGHEN: Then the names are posted up, the public become aware of the fact, and the same revulsion of feeling sets in. It may be suggested that this provision might be abused on polling day by too many challenges, but the same check exists in that respect. If people are sworn recklessly on polling day, it hurts the candidate whose agent does the swearing. The friends of those sworn make up their minds that they do not like that kind of work. I have known votes to go the other way as a result of instances similar to this; the thing works out all right in the end. It has worked out all right in Saskatchewan and Alberta, and the people there are not a bit better than the people down in Nova Scotia and New Brunswick; the enumerators are not a bit better or worse. It is in the interests of all concerned that the enumerators do the work in such a way that it will be acceptable to the public. It is suggested by some hon. gentlemen that we employ the township clerks to assist in making up the lists. The insuperable difficulty in that respect is that a township includes

many polling divisions and you cannot work this Act out unless you have an enumerator for each division. That is the basic principle of the Act. The polling division is the unit and the enumerator attends to that division; he is right there on polling day; he does his work as best he can; he has to make out his certificates of refusals. If we appointed township clerks we would have to have many deputies.

Mr. ROSS: Not at all; the deputy returning officer would do the work.

Mr. MEIGHEN: No, the deputy returning officer has not been doing the work all along. The enumerator has been doing the work, or, in the case the hon. gentleman suggests, the township clerk. He knows the lists; he knows Mrs. Smith; he knows why John Brown is off the list. He is in a position, consequently, to do the work well on election day. On the contrary, the deputy returning officer would be a new man on the job. He would have his other duties to attend to, and you could not reasonably heap these new duties upon him.

Mr. McCRANEY: Very frequently in the West we have to appoint enumerators as deputy returning officers, because there are many districts in which you cannot get two men.

Mr. MEIGHEN: Where there are small polls it might be necessary.

Mr. L. A. LAPOINTE: It is half an hour since my suggestion of this afternoon, that this Bill be reprinted, was endorsed by my hon. friends from Carleton (Mr. Carvell) and Halifax (Mr. A. K. Maclean).

Mr. MEIGHEN: It is half an hour since the Bill went down to be reprinted.

Mr. L. A. LAPOINTE: I am glad to hear that the order has been given. We have lost half an hour, because it is difficult to understand this Bill as we have it. I hope that the Secretary of State will present a Bill with a proper classification of the clauses so that we shall be able to understand it. I suggest that we should discuss one clause at a time, so that everybody will know what is being discussed. I am glad that the Government has acceded to my request to have this Bill reprinted so that it may be presented in proper form.

Mr. W. H. BENNETT: Perhaps the committee is not acquainted with all the facts with regard to the ordinary ridings in Ontario. The member for West Middlesex (Mr. Ross) suggests that the township clerks should prepare the list of names to be added. If he will think for a moment, I am sure his experience will tell him that the ordinary township clerk has something other to do than the business of a township clerk. In one township the man may be a druggist. The ordinary township—I am not speaking about those which are irregularly shaped—is about twelve miles by fourteen miles. Surely you would not expect a druggist or a merchant—and many country merchants are township clerks—to go over an area of twelve miles by fourteen miles in order to ascertain which women in that area may be entitled to be put upon the list under this caption. That would be quite without the mark. Let us consider another fact. The ordinary polling division, at least in my county, comprises at least between 150 and 200 names. If you have an enumerator in that district, he will be able to cast his eye over it and recall the names of the men in that district who have enlisted. It is then an easy matter for him to tabulate those names and prepare the list. Surely not much expense will be incident to that. As to the question of the enumerator remaining as it were in appeal, the Bill says:

> The enumerator shall attend at the time and place so designated for at least two consecutive hours on each of said ten days,

And so on. That will not mean much expense. Our hon. friends from the Maritime Provinces speak of all those officers being appointed, as it were, by law. As a matter of fact, in Ontario in many municipalities the same man may not be township clerk for two years running. He is simply appointed by the township council or the town council. One man may be assessor this year. He may become disgusted with the smallness of the salary, or he may have some other cares that take up his time, and may give up the position. The assessor is a "come and go" man. Yet the basis of the lists of the whole township comprising 600 or 700 names is prepared by a man who may be an assessor this year and who may never be an assessor again. He is in no sense an official of a Government, either provincial or federal; he is simply the creature of the township council for that year. The ordinary township clerk may be a farmer or a merchant. Surely you can expect an enumerator to put on the names of ten or twenty women in a division that will have from 150 to 200 names when you can trust him to put on the names in a township of 600 or 700 people. The matter is simple. No man in a polling division is going to be so grossly unfair to his

neighbours as to exclude one woman or one girl who may be entitled to vote on account of being a wife or sister of a soldier at the front. As a matter of fact, the names will all be disclosed, because under this measure the man has to post up the list, and if he left one person's name off it would show that he was a partisan, and the mistake would in any event be corrected. Although the system is new in the old-settled districts of Ontario, it is not new in the unorganized districts such as Thunder Bay, Nipissing and parts of Muskoka and Parry Sound. This system of enumeration has gone on in those districts year after year, and I have never heard any complaint about it. The whole system of enumeration is so simple, it will prove so inexpensive, it is so summary and the people are so brought face to face with their individual enumerator, that there can hardly be any cause for complaint. When the facts are realized by hon. gentlemen from the Maritime Provinces, they will see, that at least in Ontario, the matter is a very simple one and should commend itself as being perfectly plain.

Mr. LALOR: I understand that the 1916 list is the last revised list we have in Ontario. What are the duties of the enumerators that are appointed? Do they simply add the names of the women voters to the list of 1916? Is that list the adopted list, or is there a means of putting qualified voters, other than women, on the list?

Mr. MEIGHEN: In Ontario, excepting cities or towns of over 9,000 population, the list, as prepared in 1916, is final, except that the enumerator may strike off any one because he is an alien or a conscientious objector and add on women who are qualified as being relatives of soldiers. He cannot do anything else. Further, as to the suggestion that has been pressed latterly, it may be recalled that Ontario now adopts the enumeration system. They call the enumerator a registrar, but he is an enumerator, in fact, even more so than he is under this Bill, because he is directed by the Act to go from house to house and to enumerate the voters. He must go out into the highways and byways and compel them to go on the list. It is not his duty to sit and wait until they come to him. We do not instruct the enumerator how he is to do his work. His duties are so local that it might not be necessary for him to go out at all, but he must get the names.

[Mr. W. H. Bennett.]

Mr. LALOR: The difficulty with accepting the list of 1916 is, I am afraid, that a great deal of injustice will be done to many electors. The hon. member for West Middlesex (Mr. Ross) mentioned non-residents. Many people move from one county to another, or from one town to another. In Ontario such people cannot vote in the riding they have left, having ceased to be residents. With us their names are put on the list for the place in which they have taken up residence. This is done each year by means of a court of revision. I would like to see a similar provision in this measure by which such men could get on the lists in the place in which they reside. In the town in which I live there are many qualified voters who will not be on the list at all because there is no machinery provided by which they can get on. The enumerator should be given the power to accept affidavits, as is done in the court of revision in Ontario. By means of affidavits, or by presence in a court to which he might go, a man should be able to get on the list. I am sorry to hear that there is no provision made by which these people may get on the lists.

Mr. L. A. LAPOINTE: As it is decided to have this Bill reprinted, I would suggest that where there is a new section, or where there are one or more words inserted or added to a section, those new words or sections should be put in brackets, so that we shall know exactly what is old and what is new. If there was only a slight amendment to a section we could pass it very quickly. In that way, by reading section by section, you will find out what is changed. That is done in the province from which I come.

Mr. OLIVER: Might I draw the attention of the Solicitor General, following out the suggestion of the hon. member for Montreal, St. James, (Mr. L. A. Lapointe), to the fact that recently the Minister of the Interior (Mr. Roche) submitted to the House amendments to the Dominion Lands Act prepared in very complete form for the information of the members. I do not know whether it is too late now for the Secretary of State to adopt such a suggestion, but I do wish to say that the form in which the Minister of Interior submitted to the House his amendments to the Dominion Land Act was most complete in the information given, both by comparison and by explanation, and I would recommend very strongly that the Secretary of State adopt the same form in regard to this Fran-

chise Act. The Minister of the Interior would be able to explain just what the character of the preparation was. I can assure the minister that to have an amending Bill placed in the hands of members in the form in which the amendments to the Dominion Land Act were prepared would save an enormous amount of time and discussion, and give the members full information in regard to the changes that are being made.

Mr. MICHAUD: In the province of New Brunswick the local custodian of the lists is the secretary-treasurer of the county, and at every provincial election he is called upon to deliver the voters' lists to the returning officer, and on declaration day the returning officer makes a parcel of all these lists and sends them to the Provincial Secretary. We had a provincial election in New Brunswick in the month of February last, and the lists of 1917, which were prepared in 1916, are no longer in the hands of the Provincial Secretary. All that he could give to the enumerator under this Bill would be a copy of those lists. But if that would be satisfactory to the enumerator, well and good.

Mr. MEIGHEN: The lists are now filed with the Clerk of the Crown in Chancery, and have become the official lists.

Mr. MICHAUD: And the enumerator could get them from the Clerk of the Crown in Chancery?

Mr. MEIGHEN: Oh, yes. Answering the hon. member for Haldimand, if his suggestion were carried out and the provisions of the western provinces were applied to the province of Ontario, and that would mean making a new list from the ground up, using the old list as a basis only. I fear there would be no justification for that in the province of Ontario. Even if the present law were applied without any new Act at all, it would mean the adoption of the very same lists and the consequences of that adoption. As to the printing of this Bill it seems to me it would not be impossible to have the amendments in italics, and I will endeavour to have that done.

Mr. McCRANEY: Is my understanding of the matter correct, that the principle of the tied ballot has been taken from the present law of Alberta, or has it been repealed?

Mr. MEIGHEN: My understanding is not the same as that of the hon. member for Edmonton. I have not looked at the statute, but my information—and it comes from one who certainly ought to know—is that the tied ballot exists in provincial elections in Alberta to-day. We have the same principle here, although much enlarged and improved. In Alberta all they can do is to vote on oath, and if they vote on oath that ballot is tied. They cannot challenge a vote, tie the ballot and have it submitted to a judge. We allow that here. In Alberta all that is done with a tied ballot is that some Justice of the Peace tries the case the next day, or within a few days. We subject it to a judge.

Mr. McCRANEY: I have not had any experience of the tied ballot since the provincial election of 1905, and my recollections of it may be somewhat at fault, but in Saskatchewan we had the same provision at that time, I suppose, as they had in Alberta, because both elections were being run under the same law. My recollection of it is that any person challenged would have his ballot put in an envelope and it would be laid on one side as a tied ballot. Before the voter left the polling booth he would be handed an appointment by the deputy returning officer naming an hour within a couple of days when he was to appear before one of two Justices of the peace, near the place of polling, and the right of the voter would then be tried out. I understand from what the Secretary of State says that while this law introduces the tied ballot there is no local tribunal and everything is held up pending a recount. I attended some local tribunals in connection with the elections of 1905. There are always a number of votes tied up, but these cases are very often quickly settled to the satisfaction of all parties before a Justice of the Peace, without any need for referring them to a judge. That is to say, the fact that there is the right of examination and of investigation will obviate the necessity of taking an appeal from the local tribunals to the judge. At the last election I had a county 130 miles long and 60 miles wide, with 147 polling places, and nearly 10,000 votes were cast. Under such a system as this Bill provides it would surprise me very much if there were not at least ten per cent of the ballots tied up. The very cumbrous machinery which makes it so difficult for a person whose ballot is tied, and who lives sixty or seventy miles away from a judicial centre, is a great inducement to an opponent to tie up a vote. If there was a local tribunal where both sides could get information, it would settle a great deal of that. I do not like these tied ballots at all, and

the Secretary of State will find that our elections in the West are going to get into a terrible mess if there are one or two thousand votes—and I venture to say that that will occur—which will have to come before the judge for trial. Imagine the examination of several hundreds of people, even in a judicial matter, with other witnesses possibly coming in.

Mr. MEIGHEN: The hon. gentleman has forgotten, or possibly has not observed, the conditions under which a ballot can be tied. First, the enumerator must have refused a man the right to vote. Now those cases would not be many.

My hon. friend feels that there may be a great many challenged ballots, but there is a great check which never was used in the provincial contest. The agent must take an oath that he has grounds for believing, and does believe, that the man appearing to vote has not the right to do so, and he must swear to the reasons for so believing. Of course, he may take oath lightly, and there are some who will, and there would then be a number of tied ballots; but I do not think the election will be in a "mess" on that account. It would hurt the candidate if they tied too many ballots. In any event, supposing they did, it simply means there will be some delay until it is decided. In this contest, in war time, there is bound to be many a delay before we know who is elected, because the soldiers' votes count will not be here for many days after. I apprehend that in this coming contest many a one will not know whether he is elected or not for many days after the election. This is unfortunate, but it is true.

Mr. McCRANEY: I think this is going to be an uncertain election for probably a month after election day. We will not know absolutely who is elected, and who is not, for perhaps that length of time after the polling day. My recollection is that in the election in the city of Prince Albert in 1905, there were over 300 tied ballots.

Mr. MEIGHEN: There was no check, though.

Mr. McCRANEY: Not of this character. I do not know that the objection is removed very much, because I think if you post up a list and perhaps only ten days before the polling day you have several hundred names —

Mr. MEIGHEN: Just 300; that is the maximum.

[Mr. McCraney.]

Mr. McCRANEY: My hon. friend says "just 300," but in some places you will have 500, because you are going to take the township as your unit, or something like that, and you will find it necessary to have polling places where there will be only half a dozen. It is just as easy to take 300 votes in one ballot box, as to take 200, if it is a convenient place for voting. You will have some polling places in which there will be a very large number of ballots in one box, and in which there must be a tremendous amount of information obtained. I have spoken to the minister with regard to registration in cities, and he expressed the view a few moments ago that it is desirable to have as much finality as possible. Will he tell me whether he has given consideration to the proposal to have a registration which will be complete with all proper appeals taking place in our cities. Because it is there the great difficulty over this tied ballot will come. There will be more challenges and so on on account of lack of information, whereas if the applicants for registration have to take the oath before they come on, it is a very simple matter.

Mr. MEIGHEN: Of course, in Ontario cities is done. The provincial authorities have a regular board on which sits a judge to do this work, and we simply have to adopt the machinery.

Mr. GRAHAM: That is the registration.

Mr. MEIGHEN: It is called that. It is really enumeration. In the west, there is no such machinery. We would have to reerect the machinery and would have to constitute the whole board. We would have to apply the law to suit the times and conditions. I think we would be obliged to have something different in each province. In British Columbia for instance, there is machinery for revision, but it is revision by a provincial officer. Of course it would not do to accept that. In Alberta, there is no machinery at all, neither is there in Saskatchewan. I think there is some new machinery in Manitoba, created by a later Act, I am not just sure what it is. It would be much more difficult to do it in the western provinces. I thought of trying to have something in the western provinces similar to what there is in Ontario, but it did not lend itself to the application of that principle nearly so well as it suits Ontario, and we shall use all our means to try to get it in the western provinces as we have it, and trust to the check to safeguard it, and provide for the

revision afterwards. We have not regarded it as vital even if we have to know the result later on in those western constituencies, because the result will be all the more dependable and more correct after the judges revise it.

Mr. McCRANEY: I do not altogether agree with my hon. friend's statement. I think the fact of having so many ballots tied up, and people going out of town, and so on, means that the result of the revision would make a more unsatisfactory election than if you have the registration under your own officers. It seems to me that if the sections were taken right from the Saskatchewan Act into this Act, and if you appointed your own officers to carry out your own registration, had the same system of appeals and everything else, you would get a satisfactory list, in the cities at any rate.

Mr. A. K. MACLEAN: It is quite evident we cannot make very much progress to-night, and with the new Bill printed and in our possession to-morrow I think we, on this side of the House, will be in a position to contribute more to the passage of the Bill than we can possibly do now. Our last session was very long, and I would suggest to the Secretary of State that the committee rise for the evening. I do not think there is very much to be gained by sitting longer now.

Mr. LALOR: I agree to some extent with the hon. member for Saskatoon (Mr. McCraney) as to the necessity for some system of registration. I think it should be extended to towns of 2,000 people. I know from my own experience in working on voters' lists in the province of Ontario, if we adopted the lists of 1916 and made no provision whatever for adding names, we should disqualify a good many citizens.

Mr. SUTHERLAND: I think the new law with regard to voters' lists passed by the Ontario Legislature at the last session made some provision along the lines suggested by my hon. friend from Haldimand (Mr. Lalor), and I was a little surprised to hear the Solicitor General state that no such provision was made in this Bill. I thought the tied ballot covered those who might move from one constituency to another. If the lists of 1916 are to be used in the province of Ontario, a great many persons outside of the places of 9,000 and over will certainly be disfranchised. There has been a great movement, of population. For instance, people working in munition factories in towns of less than 9,000 have moved, and will be disfranchised unless some provision is made. I do not see any reason why the tied ballot should not cover cases of that kind. In the rural districts, a great many tenant farmers change in the spring of the year. A man might move just across the line from one constituency into another, and if no provision is made for it, he will have no redress and cannot tender his vote. The towns and cities of 9,000 and over have always had a great advantage over the rural districts in that respect, because they have registration, and their lists are right up to date when the election comes on.

In view of the length of time that has elapsed since the lists were made up in Ontario and the great changes that have taken place because of people working in munition factories and other places, I think it is important that an effort should be made to meet this situation.

Mr. MEIGHEN: My only duty now is to make fully understood the proposals that are made by my hon. friend from Haldimand (Mr. Lalor) and my hon. friend from South Oxford (Mr. Sutherland). If their suggestions are carried out it means the making of new lists by enumerators for Ontario outside of the cities commencing right at the very beginning. It means that in any event. It is true, the old lists might be used as a basis, but they would be new lists and the enumerators would have to decide who should go on and who should not, subject to the revision by a judge. Of course, these hon. gentlemen may have had in their minds that you could have a revision first in the counties, the same as in the cities, but you could not because there are not enough judges to have the work done in time to have an election by next March. It is different in the country districts from what it is in the cities. The territory to be covered is too great to enable the people to get there; you could not do it. The only way to do is to make new lists commencing at the beginning and then depending on the tied ballot for a revision afterwards. I am not afraid of the tied ballot. I hope it will not be abused, but still I do not want to resort to it any more than is necessary. The plan of the Bill was worked out and it was realized that in Ontario we would have to put up with the fact that there were some people who would be disfranchised. But if we passed no Act at all that would be the effect of the present legislation. That is the only list there is,

that is the list in force and we have to abide by it. Of course, it is not impossible to throw away the lists in Ontario, and, commencing at the bottom, make new lists just as we provide in this Act and just as the Ontario Act provides.

Mr. GRAHAM: It is much more lengthy.

Mr. MEIGHEN: Much more lengthy, and it has its disadvantages as well as its advantages. I readily admit that there are going to be quite a number who will be unfortunate enough to lose their votes, and there will be some who will be fortunate enough to get votes who should not get them. But is it worth while to make such a great change?

Mr. SUTHERLAND: I would not suggest that you should do away with the old list and make new ones, but I had hoped that there would be some possibility of taking care of the voters who are shifted around. I think it would be a mistake to do away with the old lists. It would be much more satisfactory to use the lists as already compiled.

Mr. LALOR: No very great hardship or injustice would be done to the farming community because the changes are very few. The injustice is going to be done in the towns of less than 9,000 inhabitants. If some provision could be made by which a revision would take place in towns of 2,000 to 9,000 inhabitants it would obviate a very great injustice. In those towns some provision might be made for a revision of the lists before a judge.

Mr. GLASS: The matter that the hon. member for South Oxford and the hon. member for Haldimand have referred to seems to me can to some extent be remedied. In Ontario, domicile and residence is essential to the privilege of voting. If an elector moves around from one township to another the oath requires him to swear that he is domiciled within the district at the time the vote is taken. Surely we accept the principle that where a man has a vote he must not be deprived of that vote. Why cannot a provision be inserted in the Bill that if a man who is qualified to vote except for domicile moves from one part to another he may go back to the place of his former domicile and vote? There is in this Act, and there has been in the Ontario Act, a discrimination against the country districts, although I do not think there is any very grievous feeling about it. There is provision enabling those living in cities and towns to apply to a judge to have the names of those who have been omitted and those who have become eligible since the last revision put on the list. There is an anomaly in connection with this Bill to which I would direct the attention of the Secretary of State. There are a number of young men—and this condition more generally prevails in the country districts—who were under 21 years of age when the 1916 lists were revised and who have become of age or will become of age between the time that the last lists were revised and the time when it will be necessary to make the new enumeration. It is an unreasonable and unnecessary anomaly to say that the sisters, mothers and female relatives of soldiers who have become of age shall have votes, whereas the younger brothers, who have been held at home on the farm to enable the older ones possibly to go to the front, are deprived of their votes. Provision might be made to include the names of such young men as may be of legal age at the time the enumeration is being made. I think it would appeal to every hon. member of this House that, if we extend that recognition to the female relatives, we might fairly extend it to the younger brothers who have come of age since the 1916 voters' lists were revised.

Mr. GRAHAM: These same points have been argued for a great many years in the legislature of Ontario. No lists can be made under which some person will not be deprived of a vote who under ordinary conditions would vote. There have been difficulties from time immemorial arising with regard to a man moving from one constituency to another. Provision was made for cheesemakers and clergymen who had moved from one constituency to another.

As to registration in towns of 2,000, I do not know what the situation is now. When I was in the legislature of the province, members objected to registration being extended to the smaller towns on account of the great expense. A man who has not lived in a town or city where there is registration does not understand that he might just as well run an election as a registration. It reminds me of an anecdote told by an ex-Provincial Secretary, of a gentleman whom he approached one day for a subscription to another candidate who was running. This gentleman represented a constituency which only required a candidate to get the convention and his election was assured. When he asked for a little financial aid for a candidate this gentle-

man inquired, "But, has he had his convention?" and the reply was: "He is not going to have a convention; he is a candidate." Then this gentleman said: "What does he need the money for, if he is not going to have a convention?" Hon. gentlemen who are asking for registration may not find it so convenient when they have the registration. I would just about as soon have an election as a registration. One of the difficulties is that the lists are left at loose ends in large towns, and men pay no attention and make no effort to get on the list until the time arrives, and then there is a great struggle to get on the list. Is this not the situation to-day? If there had been no legislation passed in the province of Ontario, and the law stood as it has been for many years, and we were holding an election, now or within two or three months from now, would we not use identically the same lists that would be used under this Act, except for the new conditions? So that the conditions are unchanged. The lists of Ontario have not been finally revised, and would not be revised, under the old conditions probably, until December. An election held before December would have been held on the list of 1916, just as this election will be held. So that the difficulties outlined by hon. gentlemen are the difficulties which would have arisen had the law not been changed in Ontario, no matter when you have the election.

Mr. GLASS: In Ontario, where elections have been held when the lists were not completely revised, the lists were used in the townships in which they had been revised. The hon. member for South Perth (Mr. Steele) tells me, not for Dominion elections. I am not talking about that, but I know in certain townships within my own riding, where the lists have been revised within 60 days, which is necessary in order that they may be used, the lists of that current year were used, whereas in the other townships the lists of the previous year were used.

Mr. GRAHAM: Not many of them are revised at the present time.

Mr. GLASS: Some of them were revised in the first month.

Mr. MEIGHEN: I desire to refer the hon. member for East Middlesex (Mr. Glass) to sections 151 and 152 of the Dominion Elections Act, which provide for residential voting. They are repealed in this Act, consequently the list stands just as it stood for each polling division in Ontario. Though a man may have moved into another division, he still has his vote in the old division.

Mr. NESBITT: Where he is on the list?

Mr. MEIGHEN: Yes.

Mr. ROSS: That is not fair. Supposing a man had not been on the list any place, and he moves into another riding, the enumerator has not power to put him on. He has only power to put females on.

Mr. MEIGHEN: That is all.

Mr. ROSS: I have not been influenced by anything said by the hon. member for Haldimand, or the hon. member who has just spoken. It seems to me that I am absolutely right in regard to the clerk doing the work which the hon. gentlemen proposes that the enumerator shall do, and for many reasons. This Government has made a great many sanctimonious protestations that it wants to be absolutely fair, and not partisan in regard to the soldiers' vote and in regard to this Act, and the minister says he is willing to consider amendments. Let me make a suggestion with regard to these clerks as far as Ontario is concerned. The voters' lists of 1916 are to be used in Ontario. How will they prepare the lists? The assessor prepares his assessment roll, and hands it to the clerk. The clerk copies it off, prepares his voters' list, and passes it on, and that voters' list is revised by the judge. The clerk in each municipality has more thorough knowledge in regard to the lists than any other man in the township. He has gone over the lists of appeals made by the various parties before the judge and court of revision. Every soldier, whether across the seas or at home, appears in that list, and the clerk knows who each soldier is. The consequence is that, if we appoint the clerk of the county instead of the enumerator, he is necessarily seized of the names of the soldiers, and he knows who they are. On account of the prominence of the county clerk, in my part of the country he is absolutely acquainted with the township, and all the people in it, and he consequently knows who the soldiers and the soldiers' wives and mothers are. That does away with the objection of the hon. member for East Simcoe (Mr. W. H. Bennett). The clerk does not require to go through the township to find out who the women are, because he knows them on his own knowledge, and the soldiers are already on the list.

Mr. MEIGHEN: If he knew the names of the soldiers, would he know the names of the sisters, mothers and wives?

Mr. ROSS: To a great extent he would.

Mr. LALOR: Is it not a fact that, in many municipalities, the clerk has become a very old man?

Mr. ROSS: In some cases he is. My hon. friend is justifying my argument that the clerk is a prominent official, and if he is a very old man, he has been there a long time, and is all the better acquainted with the soldiers and their relatives, so that he does not have to go around the township, as the hon. member for East Simcoe suggests. But even if he had to go round the township, he could do it in less time than any one else. Under the provisions of this Act, if any person is left off, there are ten days within which to make application, and they can make application to the clerk just as well as to the enumerator. One of my hon. friends said the list could be corrected if any mistakes were made by the enumerator. But the list cannot be corrected under this Act, except on a recount. Under section 62 of the Bill, as I read it, there is nothing the deputy returning officer could do that the enumerator could not do. Section 62 of the Act as amended by this Bill will read as follows:

> Subject to the provisions of section 65A of this Act, any person whose name is not on the voters' list of a polling division, but who claims that it should be thereon, may, at any time during which the poll is open, apply to the enumerator of such polling division.

On what ground can he or she apply to be a voter? Just because she is a relative of a soldier or on the ground that she has been improperly rejected by the clerk as an alien? These are simple things. What are they to do? They have simply to make an affidavit under this Act, showing that they are not aliens, or that they are entitled to be on the list as soldiers' relatives. Surely the deputy returning officer can go into that matter, as well as the enumerator.

Mr. MEIGHEN: Does the hon. gentleman think a returning officer has time to take down the names of soldiers, their relatives and antecedents? Has the voting all to stop while he is doing this?

Mr. ROSS: My hon. friend said a little while ago that there would be few of such men. Each polling subdivision accommodates 300 voters. The fact is that this Government proposes to appoint anywhere from 15,000 to 25,000 enumerators.

Mr. MEIGHEN: There would be just as many under my hon. friend's plan.

Mr. ROSS: I beg my hon. friend's pardon; there would be no such thing.

Mr. MEIGHEN: There will not be much pay for each one, because his work will be neither long nor heavy. You cannot work this Act unless you have some one to take care of each poll—some one who has made the list for the poll and knows all about it. I do not see why my hon. friend did not raise this point years ago, because the same thing has been done in Alberta and Saskatchewan and his objections would apply as much in that case as in this.

Mr. ROSS: Does my hon. friend deny that 15,000 enumerators will be appointed by the Government?

Mr. MEIGHEN: I have not counted the number, but there will be someone to do the work at each poll. There will have to be 15,000 deputy returning officers, and there will have to be so many returning officers. The deputy returning officer cannot undertake the revision of the lists on the day of polling. In some polls he might, but not in a poll designed to accommodate 300 voters.

Mr. ROSS: I am not asking that the deputy returning officer make up the list. My hon. friend does not appreciate my point. The clerk makes up the list and is most familiar with it. The only thing the deputy returning officer does is this: if a man comes on polling day and says he should be on the list but was struck off by the clerk, the deputy returning officer examines his qualifications. I am asking that my hon. friend add to the duty of the deputy returning officer that of deciding, the comparatively few cases that will arise whether a man was wrongfully on the list or was wrongfully eliminated from the list. I ask him further to apply a non-partisan system to the choice of those who shall make up the list in Ontario, rather than an utterly partisan system which lends colour to the suspicion that the Government does not wish to be fair in the administration of this Act.

Sir ROBERT BORDEN: I think that the language of my hon. friend is rather extravagant. I call his attention to section 42 of the Dominion Elections Act, which in part is as follows:

> In the provinces of Saskatchewan and Alberta, the Governor in Council may appoint

enumerators to make lists of the electors in the electoral district.

That has been the law of this country so far as these provinces are concerned for twelve years. My hon. friend has only now come to the conclusion that a system of that kind is intensely partisan. Why did this not dawn on him during all these years? Why has he suddenly awakened to the conclusion that it is an iniquitous thing that the Governor in Council should appoint enumerators? The suggestions that have been made on both sides of the House will be taken into attentive consideration; we will proceed with the Bill to-morrow. But there are other sections of the Bill which have not yet been touched and upon which I should like to offer some explanation. I move, therefore, that further consideration of section 1 be postponed in order that we may proceed to the consideration of section 2.

Motion agreed to.

On section 2—Part III to operate as amended:

Sir ROBERT BORDEN: In accordance with suggestions made from the other side of the House, Part II of the Dominion Elections Act, with the amendments proposed, is to be printed, in order that it may be placed in the hands of hon. gentlemen to-morrow afternoon with a view to a clearer understanding of the Act. Part III is very long; we should not have time to have it printed by to-morrow. But in any case that is not necessary, because the changes are very few. The changes in Part III are embodied in section 2 of this Act; I will state them now, so that a complete record will be in the hands of hon. gentlemen to-morrow afternoon as to what the Act will be with the amendments proposed to be effected by the Bill now under consideration.

Section 2 provides that in the first place section 143 of the Dominion Elections Act shall be struck out and the section provided here shall be substituted. Section 143 of the Dominion Elections Act is as follows:

143. Where there is a voters' list, each elector shall, subject to the provisions of the next following section, except,—

(a) in the provinces of Saskatchewan and Alberta and the Yukon Territory; and,

(b) in case of non-resident electors provided for in Part I, of this Act;

be entitled to vote at the polling station of the polling division or one of the polling divisions upon the list of voters for which his name is entered as such voter, and at no other.

2. In the province of Prince Edward Island, subject to the provisions relating to officers and agents employed at an election, every elector qualified to vote in the electoral district in which he resides shall vote in such district in the electoral division, or, in case such electoral division is subdivided, in the polling division thereof in which he resides, and not elsewhere; and every elector qualified to vote in an electoral district in which he does not reside shall vote in the polling division thereof in which is situate the property on which he claims to vote, and not elsewhere.

As will be observed, that is struck out and the following substituted as section 143:

143. Except as otherwise provided in this Act, each elector shall be entitled to vote at the polling station of the polling division, or of one of the polling divisions, upon the list of voters for which his name is entered as an elector, and at no other.

The next change is in section 136. Section 136 as it stands at present in the Dominion Elections Act is as follows:

136. The poll shall be opened at the hour of nine of the clock in the forenoon and kept open until five of the clock in the afternoon of the same day; and each deputy returning officer shall, during that time, in the polling station assigned to him, receive, in the manner hereinafter prescribed, the votes of the electors duly qualified to vote at such polling stations.

It is proposed by this Bill to amend that so that it will read as follows:

136. Except in the cities of Calgary, Edmonton, Halifax, Hamilton, London, Montreal, Ottawa, Quebec, Regina, St. John, Toronto, Vancouver, Victoria and Winnipeg, wherein the poll shall be opened at the hour of six of the clock in the forenoon, and kept open until five of the clock in the afternoon of the same day; and each deputy returning officer shall, during that time, in the polling station assigned to him, receive, in the manner hereinafter prescribed, the votes of the electors duly qualified to vote at such polling station.

The next section that is touched is section 137, which reads:

137. In addition to the deputy returning officer and the poll clerk, the candidates and their agents, not exceeding two in number for each candidate in each polling station, and, in the absence of agents, two electors to represent each candidate on the request of such electors, and no others, shall be permitted to remain in the room where the votes are given during the time the poll remains open.

The section as proposed to be amended will read as follows:

137. In addition to the deputy returning officer and the poll clerk, the enumerator, the candidates and their agents, not exceeding two in number for each candidate in each polling station, and, in the absence of agents, two electors to represent each candidate on the request of such electors, and no others, shall be permitted to remain in the room where the votes are given during the time the poll remains open.

The next is section 144, which says:

144. Except in the provinces of Saskatchewan and Alberta and the Yukon Territory, the

returning officer, on the request of any elector entitled to vote at one of the polling stations, who is appointed deputy returning officer or poll clerk, or who is named the agent of any of the candidates for a polling station other than the one where he is entitled to vote, shall give to such elector a certificate that such deputy returning officer, poll clerk or agent is entitled to vote at such election at the polling station where such elector is stationed during the polling day, and, on the production of such certificate, such deputy returning officer, poll clerk or agent shall have the right to vote at the polling station where he is placed during the polling day, instead of at the polling station where he would otherwise have been entitled to vote: Provided that no such certificate shall entitle any such elector to vote at such polling station unless he has been actually engaged as such deputy returning officer, poll clerk or agent during the day of polling and that no more than two agents of any candidate shall have the right to vote at any one polling place under such certificate.

Section 144 as amended by this Bill will read:

144. The returning officer of any electoral district in the province of Ontario which contains in whole or in part any city or town to which Part II of the Ontario Franchise Act, 1917, applies, on the request of any elector entitled to vote at one of the polling stations, who is appointed deputy returning officer or poll clerk, or who is named the agent of any of the candidates for a polling station other than the one where he is entitled to vote, shall give to such electors a certificate that such deputy returning officer, poll clerk or agent is entitled to vote at such election at the polling station where such elector is stationed during the polling day, and, on the production of such certificate, such deputy returning officer, poll clerk or agent shall have the right to vote at the polling station where he is placed during the polling day, instead of at the polling station where he would otherwise have been entitled to vote. Provided that no such certificate shall entitle any such elector to vote at such polling station unless he has been actually engaged as such deputy returning officer, poll clerk or agent, during the day of polling and that no more than two agents of any candidate shall have the right to vote at any one polling place under such certificate.

The further amendments effected by this section are to strike out the the whole of sections 149, 150A, 151, 152, 152A and 247. It is hardly necessary that I should read all those sections because they are before hon. gentlemen in the provisions of the Dominion Elections Act, and a supply of copies of that Act has been placed on the Table available for their use. I think the rest of the section does not require any particular explanation because it is all embodied on the face of the Bill.

Mr. ROSS: I understood the Solicitor General to say that, on account of the repeal of section 151 of the Act, if a voter left a riding in which he was on the list and went to another riding, he could come back to vote.

[Sir Robert Borden.]

Mr. MEIGHEN: Yes.

Mr. ROSS: That is not in the Dominion Elections Act. That applies only to a voter who moves to another electoral district in the same city or incorporated town. In that case he could go back to the former electoral district to vote, but if he removed from one riding to another, he could not go back to his own riding.

Mr. MEIGHEN: This Bill provides, by section 2, which has just been read by the Prime Minister, that any elector may vote wherever his name is. That is the new section 143:

Except as otherwise provided in this Act, each elector shall be entitled to vote at the polling station of the polling division, or of one of the polling divisions, upon the list of voters for which his name is entered as an elector, and at no other.

The only place where there is any exception at all is in section 151, or section 152. As those two are repealed, a man can vote wherever his name is.

Mr. CARVELL: I was very sorry to see that, although it does seem to follow very largely the provisions of the section as it stood before. In my province there has for some time been a provision that if a man moves from one electoral district to another he applies to the secretary treasurer of the district or county in which he resided, who gives him a certificate. That is taken to the secretary treasurer of the new district, and a certificate is granted to the man by which he can vote where he lives. In New Brunswick the question of residence plays a very important part. A person can vote only in the county in which he resides. What I am afraid of in this legislation is that you will break up all that idea. If a man's name is added to the list we shall say in St. John, he may have removed to Restigouche, two or three hundred miles away, and that would mean he would have to go back to St. John to vote. I am afraid that will be the way in which the matter will work out if this section is permitted to go through. While it is true, under the provincial law—and we are taking the provincial law as the basis of this list—they would have the right to change that man's name from the county in which he formerly lived to the one to which he removed and make it a part of the voters' list. I am somewhat doubtful, if this is put through as it is, if they would have

any right to make a new list, or if the provincial authorities would have a right to make an addition to the existing lists.

Mr. MEIGHEN: I think they would not have.

Mr. CARVELL: I can assure my hon. friend that it is going to make a lot of trouble with us. It is going to break up that for which we have been working for a long time, and which has given a great deal of satisfaction. There is another thing. I do not know what the Prime Minister means; he is not getting ready to apply closure to-night, I hope.

Mr. MEIGHEN: We have all day to-morrow.

Mr. CARVELL: If we are going to have the gag applied in that way I suppose we might as well face it, but I would like to discuss this measure, as there are many things about it I do not understand. I have not been offering any factious opposition, nor do I think anybody else has, but if the Government is simply getting ready for closure, we are in a minority, and we might just as well simply throw up our hands and say all right.

Sir ROBERT BORDEN: We want full and reasonable discussion of this Bill, of course, but I would point out that a whole day was wasted on Saturday that might have been devoted to this Bill, and for no other purpose, so far as we can understand, than to obstruct the discussion of this measure. It began at three in the afternoon and lasted until ten at night.

Mr. CARVELL: I was not here. I was not responsible for it.

Sir ROBERT BORDEN: I am not blaming my hon. friend for it. I know he is not responsible.

Mr. CARVELL: I do not know that any one is responsible. I cannot understand the Government taking the ground that a Bill of this revolutionary character, which violates every principle of the British fair play which we have bragged about in this country ever since I was a boy, is going to be railroaded through Parliament. I cannot understand the Prime Minister characterizing as obstruction what is simply a reasonable amount of discussion. The Government have a majority and we are compelled to submit, but it does seem pretty hard for a man like myself who has not obstructed the Government—I have not spoken two hours altogether on all the contentious Bills that the Government have introduced this session—to be denied the right not merely of offering criticism, but of getting information, simply because my right hon. friend thinks that two or three members may have discussed something that he regards as not pertinent. That is the situation. However, as we are not gagged at the present time, I suppose I shall be allowed to ask a question or two. I think I know enough about movements to see that closure is coming, and I want to avail myself of this present grace to see if I cannot get a little bit of information before the axe falls. I am amazed at the Prime Minister of Canada, I simply cannot get around it, Mr. Chairman. If it was some other member on the opposite side of the House I should not have been surprised, but that a man born and bred in the Maritime Provinces, who knows what justice is, that a man of his education and training, should try to force a measure of this kind through in one day—it simply amazes me. I see that paragraph (g) on page 12, says:

> A person shall be deemed to have been born in an enemy country, within the meaning of this paragraph, if he was born in a country which forms part of the territory of any country with which His Majesty is at war: Provided that a person claiming to vote who was a natural born citizen or subject of France, Italy, or Denmark, and who arrived in Canada before the date upon which the territory in which he was born became part of Germany or Austria (as the case may be) shall not be deemed to have been born in an enemy country if he produces to the deputy returning officer an unrevoked certificate in the form W|13 in the schedule. Such certificate may be issued by the enumerator.

What an awful injustice will be done to certain people in my constituency if this is allowed to go through. I suppose the clause has been framed to meet some condition in the West. It is about as bad as that other clause empowering the deputy returning officer to declare a man an alien enemy if he does not like his manner.

Mr. MEIGHEN: This is taken word for word from the Australian legislation.

Mr. CARVELL: That does not make it any better. If a vicious piece of legislation has been passed in Australia, we are not compelled to pass it here.

Mr. MEIGHEN: It covers the case of those who have come from Alsace-Lorraine and Schlesweig-Holstein.

Sir ROBERT BORDEN: My hon. friend had better get out of his mind that there is any deadly purpose in this. The people

who came to this country from Alsace-Lorraine before it became German territory, would be within the meaning of this paragraph.

Mr. CARVELL: I imagine this clause was put in to meet conditions in the West, where there is some body of people the Government want to disfranchise, I presume.

Sir ROBERT BORDEN: This is an enfranchising clause, is it not?

Mr. CARVELL: No, a disfranchising clause.

Mr. MEIGHEN: It is enfranchising.

Mr. CARVELL: I think I can read the English language. It says:

> Provided that a person claiming to vote who was a natural born citizen or subject of France, Italy, or Denmark, and who arrived in Canada before the date upon which the territory in which he was born became part of Germany or Austria (as the case may be) shall not be deemed to have been born in an enemy country.

That is, if he arrived in Canada before the territory was conquered he is not an enemy, but if he arrived in Canada afterwards he is an enemy; he is a German. In the county of Victoria there is a large colony of Danes who came from Schlesweig-Holstein after the war of 1864. I cannot say just how many there are, but I am told there are a great many of them. They left that country because they would not live under German rule. As soon as Alsace-Lorraine was ceded to Germany, or shortly afterwards these people emigrated to New Brunswick. They form one of the most thriving and intelligent communities that I have ever been in, and I know of no place in my constituency—it was formerly in the constituency of my hon. friend from Victoria and Madawaska, but is now in my constituency—that it is a greater pleasure to visit. Many of these people were not naturalized for years and years; in fact, it is only within recent years that many of them have become naturalized.

Mr. MEIGHEN: When did they come to this country?

Mr. CARVELL: Late in the sixties, or very early in the seventies. Many of them did not become naturalized until recently, and I know that some of them have never been naturalized, although they have always been voters. These men who came to this country because they would not live under German rule, who have lived here practically all their lives and raised families here, who are intelligent people in every way, are to be disfranchised.

Sir ROBERT BORDEN: What would you suggest?

Mr. CARVELL: Cut it out entirely.

Sir ROBERT BORDEN: Cut what out?

Mr. CARVELL: I do not see why on earth you want to disfranchise a man who has left a conquered country. Take the man who came from Alsace-Lorraine after 1871, is there any reason why they should be disfranchised if they came here afterwards and within fifteen years became naturalized British subjects? Surely they would not be charged with having German sympathies. I cannot understand what in the world the Government means. It brings me back to my assumption that there must be some body of men in the West they want to get after, and therefore they insert this clause. I would feel that a most serious injustice was being done to these people in my constituency, who are among the very first citizens in New Brunswick, if, by passing this legislation they were disfranchised. The Prime Minister should give us at least a reasonable chance to go over these things and discuss them. Of course, if we cannot have that chance, we cannot have it, but I think it is carrying the thing to such a ridiculous extreme that it will at least appeal to the Prime Minister as absurd.

Sir ROBERT BORDEN: I thought it was carried to an extreme when the whole of Saturday was wasted. That is my opinion, notwithstanding any view to the contrary that may be entertained on the other side of the House. I think that is where the absurdity began in the first instance. We have no desire to avoid reasonable discussion of this Bill. We would like to have the third reading not later than Friday next, and I think the third reading should take place then, because the time available for this Parliament to deal with this or any other measure is drawing to a close. After the Bill has been disposed of in this House, it will have to be dealt with in another House, and there may be considerable delay there. I am perfectly willing to give to-morrow and the day after for the consideration of the Bill in Committee, and to sit as late on either of those evenings as hon. gentlemen on the other side may desire, provided that we have an understanding that the vote will be taken on Friday night or Saturday morning at any time hon. gentlemen may select.

Mr. OLIVER: I took part in the discussion on Saturday, and I have no apology to make to the Prime Minister or to this House——

Sir ROBERT BORDEN: I am not asking for any.

Mr. OLIVER: —for having taken part in a discussion of such importance to the Dominion of Canada—not as important, I will admit, as an attempt to disfranchise tens of thousands of citizens, but still a matter of very deep and far-reaching importance. I wish to add a word to what my hon. friend from Carleton, N.B., (Mr. Carvell) has said in regard to the effect of paragraph (g) of this section. Since I came to the House this evening I received a telegram in the following terms:

Winnipeg, Sept. 10, 1917.

Hon. Frank Oliver, M.P.,
Ottawa, Ont.

Sir,—The Bohemian (Czech) National Alliance in Canada strongly objects that Bohemians who are loyal Canadian citizens should be deprived of the franchise by the War-Time Elections Act. The Bohemians in Canada are heart and soul in favour of the Allies, and are anxious that Bohemia, their native country, should be enabled to throw off the hated yoke of Austria. Bohemians have joined in large numbers the different Canadian battalions, and one company composed entirely of Bohemians was organized and went overseas with the 223rd Battalion from Portage la Prairie. Bohemians are fighting in large numbers in all the armies of the Allies. We would appeal to you to see that Canadian Bohemians are honoured for their loyalty to Canada, and not deprived of their franchise by the Act. Similar request has been wired to Right Hon. Sir R. Borden on the 5th of September.

We are, Sir,

Your obedient servants,
August Fibiger, President.
Frank Dojacek, Secretary.

Mr. A. K. MACLEAN: Following the lines suggested by the hon. member for Carleton (Mr. Carvell), I would say it would be most unjust to put this Bill through by the application of the closure. The Bill should at least have been prepared in a decent way. There can be no defence whatever for putting a Bill drafted in this way before Parliament. Surely the Prime Minister and his friends can hardly expect members of the House to grasp the purport of such a Bill quickly and easily. What is proposed to be done for us to-morrow, should have been done in the first instance. If hon. gentlemen will look at what is clause (g) of 33b on page 2, they will find two amendments in one clause, and the amended portions are so inserted that they are only recognizable because there are quotation marks at the beginning and end of the amendments. I never saw or heard of a Bill presented to Parliament in that form. There may be nothing difficult to understand about the Bill if one had an opportunity of going through it thoroughly and carefully, but this, of course, would take some time. I think the Bill should be allowed to stand until to-morrow, when we can have at least a portion of it in the form in which it should have been presented to the House at first. We have not yet discussed the greater portion of section 1, which covers ten pages. One clause of a Bill covering ten pages is confusing to most members of the House. I think we could make very substantial progress to-morrow if Part II is printed in the manner intimated by the Prime Minister. We must also remember that the officer designated as enumerator is an unknown quantity in the Maritime Provinces, and also in Quebec.

Mr. GRAHAM: And in the older districts of Ontario.

Mr. A. K. MACLEAN: The Bill was not even explained to us in a very complete way before being taken up by the committee. In introducing it, the Secretary of State simply discussed two or three of the main principles involved, that is, the disfranchising clauses, and the enfranchising clauses.

Mr. MEIGHEN: And the list-making clauses.

Mr. A. K. MACLEAN: Very little else. I would have expected that on the second reading he would explain the purport of many of the sections, as is customary. He explained the principle of the Bill on the first reading, but said nothing whatever about it on the second reading. The Bill was prepared in a way that would confuse one, and on that ground alone I trust the Government will consider the matter of postponing further consideration of it until to-morrow.

Sir ROBERT BORDEN: What do you say about Friday night?

Mr. GRAHAM: I think at the present juncture it is hardly fair to ask us to say that the Bill must have a third reading on Friday night. So far as I have heard, there is no desire to retard it, and if the Government is under the impression that such a desire exists, they have a wrong notion. I do not know how they got it into their minds, but they seem to me as if they were to have a head-on collision.

Sir ROBERT BORDEN: We thought we had a pretty good object lesson on Saturday.

Mr. GRAHAM: No one knows better than the Prime Minister that the question discussed on Saturday is one of the most vital questions affecting the people of Canada at the present time. Not pretending to know more than any one else in this House, I feel that the hon. members do not understand in detail the significance of Saturday's discussion, but perhaps they will later on. I do not think Saturday was wasted. I think the future will show that Saturday's discussion was a very important one. After all, it took up only a part of Saturday and this Bill was proceeded with on Saturday night.

Mr. MEIGHEN: How about those divisions on points of order?

Mr. GRAHAM: I was not here for those divisions. The Prime Minister thought that there was time wasted on Saturday. I say it was not wasted, and I ask hon. gentlemen to postpone their judgment for a few weeks and then come to a conclusion as to whether it was wasted or not. In a House that has been in session for month after month is it reasonable that the Government should object to one day extra for the discussion of a Bill of this magnitude? Outside of not more than twelve men in this House, not one understands this Bill, and I am not including myself in the number. I have read the Bill and I have had something to do with the preparation of voters' lists for the last thirty years. I am going away beyond the limit in putting the number at twelve. If closure had never been conceived in the mind of the Secretary of State we would never have dreamed of rushing this Bill through in this time. If closure be applied to-morrow hon. gentlemen on the other side of the House cannot make the suggestions which they want to make and we cannot make suggestions from this side. When you have made your speech you must sit down. A free and easy discussion, back and forth, in which a question can be asked and answered and information, which we all need, elicited is much better. If notice be given to-night that the motion will be made to-morrow that is excluded and this Bill will go through the House without members understanding it. I do not think that is reasonable. This Bill has been introduced, the Government admits it was not introduced in proper form, and it is going to make a rearrangement to meet the suggestions which have been made. If this Bill had been brought in with explanations as to the changes proposed we would have been in a different position. The lawyers might know by looking at it by chapter and paragraph what it all means, but there is not a man, outside of the dozen I have named, who knows what the chapters referred to in this Bill mean. There is no desire as far as I know to retard this Bill or to prolong the session. Under these circumstances, I submit, the Government ought to accept the suggestion made by my hon. friend from Carleton and let us go on with this Bill to-morrow, when we shall be in a position to discuss it more intelligently. If there are signs of obstruction to-morrow I will have no objection to the Government giving notice that they intend to apply closure, any more than I always have to applying closure because I believe it is an unfair way of doing business. But we do not know on either side of the House many of the details of what we are discussing, and I would ask the Prime Minister to accept the suggestion I make.

12 m.

Sir ROBERT BORDEN: The difficulty about it is that if we do not have the vote on the third reading on Friday we cannot very well have it until the following Tuesday.

Mr. NESBITT: Why not Saturday?

An hon. MEMBER: Why not Monday?

Sir ROBERT BORDEN: I am told that hon. members on both sides of the House do not want the vote on Saturday or Monday. They say it is very inconvenient to have the vote on either of those days.

Mr. CARVELL: What harm would it be? There are still three weeks before Parliament is dissolved. Does the Prime Minister think that the Senate is going to hold this Bill up for three weeks?

Sir ROBERT BORDEN: I do not know what the Senate is going to do.

Mr. CARVELL: I cannot understand this unseemly haste. There seems to be some reason in the mind of the Government for it, but there has never been any indication of an intention to obstruct the passage of this Bill.

Sir ROBERT BORDEN: Hon. members on both sides are agreed that the session ought to come to a conclusion.

Mr. NESBITT: That is true.

Mr. GRAHAM: Yes.

Sir ROBERT BORDEN: That is the opinion on both sides of the House. I am most anxious to give every opportunity for the reasonable discussion of the Bill, but we do not want to stay here any longer than is absolutely necessary for the purpose of affording that opportunity. I have had a good deal of regard for the intimations given to me by hon. gentlemen on both sides of this House to hurry up the business of the session and let us get away. I had that in view when I made the proposal to hon. gentlemen. We have had two days in committee on this Bill.

Mr. CARVELL: No, one day.

Sir ROBERT BORDEN: One on the second reading and one in committee.

Mr. GRAHAM: That is not very much for a Bill of this kind.

Sir ROBERT BORDEN: We have had two days on the Bill. When I proposed that we should have two days more in committee and one day for the third reading I thought it was a reasonable proposal, especially as I accompanied it with the statement that we would sit as late on those evenings as hon. gentlemen might desire, but no later.

Mr. NESBITT: If the right hon. gentleman will allow it to go as it is and then, if there is any sign of obstruction, and I personally have on intention to obstruct—

Sir ROBERT BORDEN: My hon. friend will see that if we should be driven to the expedient of a closure we could not apply it on Saturday night unless we sat until two o'clock on Sunday morning, which would be undesirable, and probably we would not be able to take the vote until Tuesday next. We know that hon. gentlemen are desirous of bringing the session to a conclusion, if possible, not later than the end of next week. I think that in this I am expressing the views of hon. gentlemen on both sides of the House. If we were to have any reasonable assurance that this could be accomplished I am sure I would not have any objection, but I understand that my hon. friends on the other side cannot presume to speak for the other House. I do not expect them to, but perhaps they might give their impression.

Mr. CARVELL: I cannot speak for the other House and I do not intend to try. I am only speaking for myself. I am not obstructing the Bill at all.

Sir ROBERT BORDEN: I do not claim that my hon. friend is obstructing.

Mr. CARVELL: I feel pretty seriously over this matter and pretty bitterly too.

Sir ROBERT BORDEN: I think my hon. friend's criticism has been reasonable.

Mr. CARVELL: The Government delay a measure of this importance until Parliament has been in session for seven months and then they come down and say: We must get through here next week. It means as much to me as to any other man in this House.

Sir ROBERT BORDEN: Would there be any objection to having the third reading on Saturday?

Mr. CARVELL: As far as I am concerned, I have no objection but I cannot bind anybody else.

Mr. BUREAU: I listened to the hon. member for Carleton (Mr. Carvell), and I understand that if closure is applied and if you put a question you have to sit down and cannot go any further. The first part of the Act as to enumerators is absolutely new in the province of Quebec.

I have been watching my chance to ask the Secretary of State what qualification this enumerator would require to possess, whether he would require to be resident of the particular polling subdivision, or the particular municipality wherein the alien resided. There is a lot of information which we have not got. We know nothing about the work of these enumerators, and I think it would be unfair if we did not have a chance to ask questions and get the information. We would like to have it, because we want to be prepared to meet this enumerator when he is appointed.

Mr. DEVLIN: Would the Secretary of State answer the question asked by the hon. member for Three Rivers (Mr. Bureau)? It is a matter which interests the province?

Mr. MEIGHEN: There is no examination or educational test, but the returning officer selects him as a man capable and available. I think the difficulty will be to get men available, but they will have to be got.

Mr. DEVLIN: Will it be the returning officer who makes the selection?

Mr. MEIGHEN: Yes, that is the way it is done.

Mr. DEVLIN: The Bill does not say that. It says that the Governor in Council—

Mr. MEIGHEN: Yes, if the Governor in Council does not appoint them, the returning officer makes the appointment. That is exactly the provision in the old Act, and that is the way they have been appointed in the province for years. It was always left to the returning officer, because in practice, nobody else could do it. We leave the Act as it stands.

Mr. CARVELL: There is no possibility of that here, because section 42 says:

> Subject to the provisions of 65A of this Act, the Governor in Council may appoint enumerators in each province to make lists of the electors in each electoral district, and the returning officer of each electoral district shall assign one of such enumerators to each polling district therein.

So that the Governor in Council must make the appointment, and once these men are appointed the returning officer has the right to assign them to their respective places.

Mr. MEIGHEN: But the next subsection says that if the Governor in Council does not appoint, the returning officer makes the appointment.

Mr. BUREAU: Whether the returning officer appoints them, or the Governor in Council appoints them, makes no difference. The Act says the enumerator shall be taken from the particular municipality where he is to act. There is nothing in the Bill which I have seen which provides for that.

Mr. MEIGHEN: The hon. gentleman, I understand, suggests that they should be from the same municipality.

Mr. BUREAU: Yes.

Mr. MEIGHEN: I should think that would be inevitable. They would have to be in the neighbourhood, or they could not do the work.

Mr. BUREAU: It is very easy to say this man should be a resident of the municipality where he is called to act as enumerator. There is nothing to prevent the returning officer or the Governor in Council from appointing a man in another place.

Mr. MEIGHEN: No, but the returning officer would not do it, because the man could not do the work. The Act has always been in that form.

Mr. BUREAU: We never had any enumerators in Quebec. We know nothing about the working of that branch of the Act. We have clerks and secretary-treasurers and municipal councillors, and secretaries of the school board. These men would know every man, woman and child, and would know where they lived. They have been there for years. The objection made by the Secretary of State to the appointment of such men was the fact that they would have too large a territory to cover.

Mr. MEIGHEN: They could not be in two or three places at once. They have to be at the polling place on election day, and they have to take care of each individual poll. That is the reason we cannot appoint a clerk of the township to take care of the township.

Mr. BUREAU: There are few municipalities that I know of in Quebec where they have more than two clerks; they seldom have three. This enumerator could take care of two polls. There is a great deal of information we desire to obtain from the Solicitor General, and many suggestions we wish to make, to guard against any appointment being made that would not assist in the working out of the Act.

Mr. A. K. MACLEAN: Is it the intention of the Bill to disfranchise persons whose place of origin was Switzerland?

Mr. MEIGHEN: Oh, no.

Mr. A. K. MACLEAN: Would those who are residing in Canada, who are naturalized not be disqualified because the mother tongue of more than one third of them is German?

Mr. MEIGHEN: If the mother tongue was German, and they came to Canada and were naturalized in the last 15 years, they would be disqualified in this election, and if the hon. member knew all the facts I do not think he would consider that was any variation of the principle of the Bill, nor any injustice.

Mr. OLIVER: I might give an instance which would have some bearing on the case. Mr. A. S. Rosenroll, a native of Switzerland, was M.L.A. for the district of Wetaskiwin for several terms in the local legislature. When the war broke out, his eldest son voluntered in the Princess Pats. He was disabled for life, and then his second son volunteered, and I am afraid he has met a similar fate.

Mr. MEIGHEN: He would be entitled to vote on three grounds.

Mr. OLIVER: Yes, I understand.

Mr. MEIGHEN: Firstly because he has been a member of the legislature; second-

ly, because the first son volunteered, and thirdly, because the second son volunteered.

Mr. OLIVER: Why should the people of Switzerland be considered pro-German when, in this particular instance, the evidence we have is that they certainly were very anti-German?

Mr. MEIGHEN: There are certainly instances where they are pro-Ally.

Mr. DEVLIN: Would the Secretary of State tell us what would be the evidence required by the enumerator to prove relationship in the case of the female relatives of soldiers? We are not accustomed to enumerators in Quebec.

Mr. MEIGHEN: It would be anything that convinces the enumerator that the woman applying is of the relationship provided in the Act. Her word will be sufficient, if he has no reason to disbelieve it. But if it is not sufficient, or if the enumerator accepts evidence that it is insufficient, then there is the right of review before a judge as provided by the Act, and the judge will then accept such evidence as he would accept in an ordinary action in court.

Mr. A. K. MACLEAN: Before six o'clock the member for Carleton raised a point in connection with section 33A, page 1 of the Bill, regarding the enfranchisement of the wives, mothers, sisters and daughters of those engaged in the naval forces of Canada.

Mr. MEIGHEN: The naval forces of Canada are defined in chapter 43 of the Naval Service Act, section 2, as follows:

> "Naval forces" means those naval forces organized for the defence and protection of the Canadian coasts and trade or engaged as the Governor in Council may from time to time direct.

I have consulted the Minister of the Naval Service, and he states that any persons who are attending college would not be included in the naval forces of Canada. Those cadets from 16 to 18 years of age and older who are on the boats actually engaged in patrol work would be included—there are about 200 of them, I think. Only those actually engaged in training in connection with this war would be included.

Mr. A. K. MACLEAN: Mine-sweeping is carried on only in Halifax and Sydney harbours. It is not a dangerous occupation, and can hardly be regarded as being within the naval service. I doubt very much whether there is any necessity for that work at all.

Sir ROBERT BORDEN: My hon. friend had better not say that unless he is prepared to put his opinion above that of the Admiralty.

Mr. A. K. MACLEAN: That may be the opinion of the Admiralty. They are making preparation for the establishing of quite a patrol service in the Maritime Provinces. For the past several weeks, even months, forty or fifty men have been living in a hotel in Halifax. They have no boats; I do not know what work they can be doing. Of course, one cannot get very far in offering opposition to a suggestion of the British Admiralty, but in my judgment there is absolutely no work on our coasts for these patrol boats. If the suggestion has been made by the British Admiralty, the Government of Canada should suggest to them that the work is purposeless.

Mr. MEIGHEN: Before going further, I want to move some amendments which are not substantial; I think they are chiefly misprints. They amend the Bill as follows:

By striking out the words and letters "and (h)" from paragraph (d) of section 2 of the Bill and inserting instead "(h) and (i)."

By striking out the figure 3 which appears in the Bill as denominating section 3 thereof and inserting instead of said figure the figures and letters 67B, and constituting said section 3 as paragraph (f) of section 2, by inserting immediately preceding said figures and letter the following: "(f) by adding as section 67B immediately following section 67A, the following:"

By enclosing within brackets the figure 4, which denominates section 6 of the Bill and constituting said section 4 as subsection (4) of section 67B of the Bill.

These amendments do not affect the purpose of the Act in any way; they simply make the arrangement of the sections more symmetrical and correct some misprints.

Amendments agreed to.

Mr. DEVLIN: Will female relatives of soldiers living in unorganized territory in the province of Quebec have the right to vote, and where will they vote?

Mr. MEIGHEN: They will vote in the polling division in which they reside—at the place where they would vote if they were enfranchised under the provincial laws of Quebec.

Mr. A. K. MACLEAN: I should like to have something more definite about the enfranchisement of the female relatives of

those engaged in the Naval Service of Canada. I do not see any reason why they should be enfranchised. I do not believe that they will appreciate it. Many female relatives of the men engaged in the Naval Service will be laughed at by their neighbours if they exercise the right of franchise under this Bill. Is the mine-sweeping in Halifax harbour now carried on by tug boats or small steamers chartered from private individuals? I do not think that the crews of those boats are within the naval service; yet they are engaged in mine-sweeping and the Secretary of State says that their wives and sisters and other female relatives will have the right to exercise the franchise.

Sir ROBERT BORDEN: As to the first part of my hon. friend's observations, consideration will be given to them. As to the second part of his remarks, I think that he is mistaken. The mine-sweeping is done by boats chartered by the Department of Naval Service and the men engaged on those boats are in the service of that department. I move——

Mr. BUREAU: Do I understand that this Bill was to be reprinted?

Sir ROBERT BORDEN: At the suggestion of hon. gentlemen on the other side we are printing Part II of the Dominion Elections Act as it will stand after the amendments affected by this Bill have been adopted. This is being done in order that hon. gentlemen may have before them a clear view of what Part II of the Dominion Elections Act will be with these amendments. This course is not usually taken, but I thought that the request was a reasonable one; having regard to the way in which this Bill is framed. I move that——

Mr. DEVLIN: Before the Prime Minister moves that fatal motion, I should like to point out to him that the suggestion was made to-day that the Bill be reprinted.

Sir ROBERT BORDEN: We are not reprinting the Bill. We are printing as I have already explained more than once, Part II of the Dominion Elections Act as it will stand after the amendments effected by this Act shall have been adopted.

Mr. DEVLIN: I have been in my seat since three o'clock. I have not asked many questions, but as a result of this legislation a good deal of new law will apply to the province of Quebec. I direct the attention of the Prime Minister to the fact that up to the present moment there has been no Bill before the committee. We have been considering amendments to an Act that has already been passed, amendments to a law already in existence. What we are considering is not a Bill proper; it will be a Bill when the law is reprinted containing the amendments. It is really impossible to say that we are considering a Bill until we have the Bill before us.

Sir ROBERT BORDEN: I think my hon. friend and I hold the same view although we express it differently. If we have not a Bill before the committee, I do not know what we have been engaged in considering all day to-day or what we were engaged in considering yesterday.

Mr. CARVELL: We have words before us, not a Bill.

Sir ROBERT BORDEN: I move:

That the further consideration of this section be postponed in order that we may proceed to section 3.

Motion agreed to.

On section 3—Questions to naturalized aliens:

Sir ROBERT BORDEN: Are there any observations with regard to this what we ought to take into consideration before we come back to-morrow? I do not think it is a very important section.

Mr. PARDEE: I did not know that the Prime Minister was going to move that we proceed to another section. Why does the Secretary of State go back to the non-resident vote? That has been done away with long since. What is the object of non-resident voting being brought into vogue again?

Mr. MEIGHEN: The non-resident vote is done away with provincially, I presume because the man who moves from one place to another can get on the list in the other place. Now that he cannot get on anywhere else because we maintain the lists as they are, and the enumerator has not power to put him on, we prefer to give him the right to vote where he formerly resided than that he should have no vote at all.

Mr. PROULX: Suppose an elector leaves my county and comes to the city of Ottawa to reside, there will be registration in the city of Ottawa and he will be put in the list here.

Mr. MEIGHEN: He can get on the list where he resides, but he can vote only in one place, although he may have his choice.

Mr. NESBITT: As a matter of fact if he moves out of a district after a certain time, he would not have a vote at all because he would not get into the city in time to have his name placed on the list.

Mr. CARVELL: The Prime Minister asked if we had any suggestions to make as to section 3. I cannot understand this section, although I suppose there may be some explanation for it. I cannot understand why you should disfranchise a man who is a naturalized British subject, who was born in an Allied country but whose mother tongue was that of an enemy country. There must be a body of people of that class, because otherwise the Government would not have inserted this section. Every one of these sections means something; they are put in this Bill for a purpose. Will the minister please explain why he proposed to disfranchise people who speak the German or Austrian language, but who are not Germans or Austrians by birth and who are British subjects by naturalization? I presume there may be Russians of that class who might speak the Austrian language.

Sir ROBERT BORDEN: German or Austrian.

Mr. CARVELL: It would be more likely Austrian than German, because we know that in southwestern Russia, Russians and Austrians intermingle and are practically the same race. Why is it that if a man is Russian-born but speaks the Austrian language, and still is a British subject, he should not have the right to vote?

Mr. MEIGHEN: There are a number of the very class described by my hon. friend, and the fact of the matter is that in their sympathies, in all their feelings in relation to this war, they are distinguishable from the German or Austrian-born. I presume in most cases they have very recently come from Germany and Austria. Moreover, in some cases they have developed a hatred of Russia.

Mr. CARVELL: I am speaking about the man who came from Russia, the man who was born in Russia.

Mr. MEIGHEN: He may have developed a hatred of that country. You may look up his naturalization certificate and see where he was born, but beyond that there is no distinction in sympathy whatever between those foreign people, provided they speak the enemy language, whether they are born in Austria or across the border. I do not know how many of them there are.

Mr. CARVELL: This is putting a tremendous power into the hands of a returning officer. It is about as vicious a feature as I have seen in this transaction.

Mr. MEIGHEN: If a man claims that he is wrongfully disfranchised, all he has to do is to vote and have his case tried.

Mr. CARVELL: My hon. friend knows how valueless that is to any man. If he gets his vote tied up in that way, he might as well throw it into the river.

Mr. MEIGHEN: I do not think so.

Mr. CARVELL: This is on a par with the rest of the Bill. The Government are disfranchising Austrians, Germans, British subjects; they are disfranchising women, in fact, it seems to me that they are disfranchising any one who they think will vote Liberal.

Mr. McCRANEY: Near the town of Rosthern in Saskatchewan there is a settlement of Russians from a community formed by them in province of Saratov, which is in the Ural mountains away from the German border altogether. Their ancestors went there over a hundred years ago. They speak both Russian and German, but German is the language of the community. So far as I am aware, their sympathies are not with the Germans in this war, but under the provisions of this Bill as it is drawn, those people will be disfranchised.

Mr. MEIGHEN: If their mother tongue is Russian, they will not be disfranchised.

Mr. McCRANEY: But the language which is used in their homes, their mother tongue, is German. They belong to the Lutheran church, and their associations rather are German.

Mr. A. K. MACLEAN: Is there not in Canada a number of Belgians who speak German?

Mr. MEIGHEN: I have never heard of any.

Mr. A. K. MACLEAN: That is the language of about one-third of the Belgians.

Mr. MEIGHEN: Some of them speak Flemish, but not German.

Mr. A. K. MACLEAN: There are a great number employed in the coal mines of Nova Scotia, and I know some of them speak German. It would not do to give the power to a returning officer to distinguish

between the German and the Flemish language. It is quite probable that some Belgians might be disfranchised by this Bill, and that would hardly be fair.

Mr. MEIGHEN: I never heard of a Belgian speaking German, but many of them speak Flemish. If a Belgian speaks German—

Mr. A. K. MACLEAN: He is gone.

Mr. MEIGHEN: —I would not like to presume he would be done an injustice by this Bill.

Mr. NESBITT: Some of the enumerators might think if a man was talking Yorkshire, he was talking German. Might I suggest before closure goes on, that in subsection 48 you increase the ten days a little, say to fifteen days?

Mr. MEIGHEN: We shall try to do that.

Mr. NESBITT: And in 65A I would suggest you increase the three days to five days.

Mr. MEIGHEN: We shall try to do that if we can.

Mr. ROSS: Will the Secretary of State consider the question of the voting of non-residents? Under the provincial law as it exists in Ontario to-day, non-residents will not be entitled to vote, and there are always some men who are deprived of a vote and who were deprived of the vote under the old law. It may be an injustice to some, but not to a great many. At the same time, however, if the law is to be as this Bill provides, it is going to re-introduce this question of bringing back non-residents to vote throughout Ontario, a thing we have been rid of for the last fifteen years, and not a desirable thing at all.

Sir ROBERT BORDEN: I move that further consideration of section 3 be postponed and that the committee proceed to section 4.

Motion agreed to.

On section 4—Names of disqualified persons not to be put on lists:

Mr. GRAHAM: There is a provision in the Bill which deals with men who have not responded to the call for military service. What provision is made for the enumerator striking these men off the list if they are already on? Has he to take the whole responsibility? What proof will be required, and where will he get his proof?

[Mr. A. K. Maclean.]

Mr. MEIGHEN: We do not make the enumerator the judge. There has to be a conviction before a court of competent jurisdiction.

Mr. GRAHAM: That is not shown in the Bill.

Mr. MEIGHEN: It says, "any man convicted."

Mr. NESBITT: This section does not apply to Italians?

Sir ROBERT BORDEN: No.

Mr. GRAHAM: In the riding I represent there is quite a large number of Poles, and I have been trying to discover just how the Bill will affect these men. Some of them may have owed allegiance to Germany, and some to Russia.

Mr. MEIGHEN: Poles as a rule speak the Polish language. Consequently, they are not affected by the Bill at all, unless they were born in Germany or Austria. If they were born in that part of Poland that at one time formed part of Germany or Austria, they come under the provisions of this Bill no matter what language they speak, but if born in Russia, they speak Polish and do not come under the Bill at all.

Mr. GRAHAM: I think they all speak the Polish language.

Mr. A. K. MACLEAN: Do the citizens of Norway and Sweden speak the same language?

Mr. MEIGHEN: A great number of them speak the Norwegian language and the Swedish language, and some of them, I think, speak the German language.

Mr. A. K. MACLEAN: It might be worth while considering another clause to this Bill in the event of Sweden becoming an enemy of the Allied powers. A great number of Norwegians might be disfranchised in this country, and I hardly think the Government would like to disfranchise the Norwegians. I should like to ask what prompted the Government to provide for the opening of the polls in the cities of Canada at six o'clock in the morning. So far as Halifax is concerned, I do not think it will be of any practical value, and I do not think the citizens will care for it. I do not think it is desirable, but I am not objecting to it if other cities in Canada desire it. I think, however, it would be much better to keep the polls in the cities open an hour

later in the evening. It is very inconvenient opening the polls at six o'clock in the morning, particularly if we are to have a winter election.

Mr. MEIGHEN: Representations have been made, chiefly on the part of the railway and labour men. Indeed, we have been asked to try and provide for the railway and commercial traveller vote outside of the county, but the expense and the difficulties in the way of an extra-constituency vote make it impracticable. We are therefore endeavouring to meet the case by opening the polls at six o'clock. This will enable nearly all the railway men and most of the travellers, especially if the election should be on a Monday, to put in their ballots. The labouring population, which, of course, is of much greater consequence, because there are a larger number of them, would also be able to get their votes in before seven o'clock without losing any time.

Sir ROBERT BORDEN: I move that further consideration of this section be postponed and that the committee proceed to section 5.

Motion agreed to.

On section 5—Interpretation:

Mr. MEIGHEN: I move to amend this section by striking out the figure 5 and substituting the figure 3. This is just a rearrangement of the clauses.

Amendment agreed to.

Mr. A. K. MACLEAN: How is the enumerator to receive evidence of the qualifications of those to be enfranchised? Can an application be made on behalf of other persons?

Mr. MEIGHEN: Yes.

Sir ROBERT BORDEN: I move that further consideration of this section be postponed, and that the committee proceed to the schedule.

Motion agreed to.

On the Schedule:

Mr. BUREAU: This afternoon I asked the Secretary of State about "complete mobilization." He said the clause would stand and that he would look into the matter and give us a definition of it. I understand the Chairman is trying to have the clause carried.

Sir ROBERT BORDEN: No.

Mr. PARDEE: Who signs the form W4? Is it the enumerator?

Sir ROBERT BORDEN: The candidate or his agent.

Mr. A. K. MACLEAN: What I really had in mind a moment ago was section 4. In effect it means that the enumerator is the judge as to whether or not a man who has lost his certificate of naturalization is a British subject. I think that should be left to some higher tribunal.

Mr. MEIGHEN: It is the simplest thing in the world. A man's certificate is proof of his naturalization. It is just a piece of paper that he keeps in his house. If there should be an error it is subject to review as any other error.

Mr. A. K. MACLEAN: It is easy if he can produce his certificate; but supposing he can not?

Mr. McCRANEY: My experience is that there must be thousands of certificates of naturalization on file with the Department of the Interior. When a homesteader applies for a patent he gives in his certificate with the application. Sometimes it comes back and sometimes it does not. I have written over and over again and had certificates taken off the files of the department and returned to the homesteader. I am sure there are many of them who do not know where their certificates are, while they are safely on file with the Department of the Interior.

Mr. MEIGHEN: Of course they will know now that the certificates are of value to them, and they will have ample time to get them.

Mr. A. K. MACLEAN: As I understand it, the certificate must be produced.

Mr. MEIGHEN: That is the proof to the enumerator, but if they will swear they are naturalized they can vote, then they can establish their naturalization even if the certificate is lost.

Mr. A. K. MACLEAN: On recount proceedings.

Mr. GRAHAM: I would like to call the attention of the Secretary of State to the fact that if closure is put on to-night and the motion made to-morrow, h will not be allowed to make any amendment except one; he will have made his speech then.

Mr. MEIGHEN: I do not know what the arrangement is, but I want to remind the hon. gentleman who is leading the Opposition that all the clauses can be considered now and the notice given. I do not think

the notice need apply to any particular day, as long as it is given at a previous sitting. I think a day might intervene under the closure rules.

Mr. GRAHAM: If the notice were given to-night and the motion were made to-morrow, then closure would apply automatically after the motion was made, if it be made. If notice be given to-night and if the motion is made to-morrow, the Secretary of State could move one amendment, and then he would be through. He would have made his speech in the twenty minutes, and could not move any further amendments.

Sir ROBERT BORDEN: Some one else could do it.

Mr. MEIGHEN: The closure simply says that a member can speak not more than once on any one clause, and for not longer than twenty minutes.

Mr. GRAHAM: That is if the closure is on one clause; but if the closure includes all the clauses, as the conduct of the Government to-night would seem to indicate to be their intention, then the Secretary of State would be through in twenty minutes. If he can speak twenty minutes on every clause, every other member of the House can also speak twenty minutes on every clause.

Mr. MEIGHEN: I think so.

Mr. GRAHAM: But if the closure covers all the sections, as I think is intended to be done judging by the manoeuvres of the Prime Minister, the Secretary of State would be confined to twenty minutes on all the clauses.

Mr. MEIGHEN: My understanding is, although I do not say I am perfectly sure I am right, that any member can speak twenty minutes on any clause, and speak twenty minutes on any other clause.

Mr. A. K. MACLEAN: May we discuss the Bill to-morrow much after the manner we have been discussing it to-day? Could you not postpone the motion after giving notice to-night?

Mr. MEIGHEN: I think so. Notice may be given to-night, and perhaps we may come to an arrangement.

Mr. GRAHAM: I would not suggest either that the Government put it on or that they do not. They are at liberty to do whatever they like. When the Bill was before us the other day we were allowed 20 minutes each and then we were through. That covered all the clauses. I suppose that will be the case to-morrow, and I would suggest that the Solicitor General should distribute whatever amendments he has among the members of the Government.

Mr. CURRIE: The Secretary of State can speak on each clause, but where the axe catches hon. gentlemen on the other side is that the debate must close at two o'clock in the morning.

Sir ROBERT BORDEN: If all the clauses should be considered, any hon. member may speak 20 minutes on each clause. I move that further consideration of the schedule be postponed.

Motion agreed to.

Sir ROBERT BORDEN: I beg to give notice that at a future sitting of the House, or the Committee, I will move that the further consideration of sections 1, 2, 3, 4, and 5, the schedule, and the title, be not further postponed, and shall be the first business of the Committee. I give this notice in the hope that we may make arrangements to-morrow morning by which it will not be necessary to make the motion. As I have already explained to the House, we are all anxious to get through with the session, and I do not think any one is more anxious than I am. I am in hopes, from a conversation with the hon. member from South Renfrew (Mr. Graham), and with the Chief Whip of the Opposition (Mr. Pardee) that we can make an arrangement to-morrow morning which will render it unnecessary for me to propose the motion of which I have just now given notice.

Mr. L. A. LAPOINTE: On the basis of the proposition just made by the Prime Minister, I hope there will be no arrangement with the Government come to, especially in view of the fact that even though the Bill has not yet been put in our hands notice of closure as been given by the Prime Minister

Progress reported.

On motion of Sir Robert Borden, the House adjourned at 12.55 a.m. (Wednesday).

Wednesday, September 12, 1917.

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

HOUSE OF COMMONS OFFICIALS.

OFFICIAL DEBATES BRANCH.

The Speaker informed the House that he had directed the Clerk of the House to lay upon the Table his recommendation to-

gether with his report on the subject of the abolition of the office of Secretary the Hansard Section of the Reporting Branch of the House and the appointment of an additional shorthand reporter in the place of such secretary.

MOTION TO READ THE ORDERS OF THE DAY.

Rt. Hon. Sir ROBERT BORDEN (Prime Minister): I move seconded by Sir George Foster, that the Orders of the Day be now read.

Sir WILFRID LAURIER: The only matters to be taken up before the Orders of the Day are a few questions and motions for papers. I suggest to my right hon. friend that the business of the House will not be delayed if we take these up first.

Sir ROBERT BORDEN: If no other matter is to be introduced, I agree to that. I withdraw the motion.

Motion withdrawn.

QUESTIONS.

(Questions answered orally are indicated by asterisks.)

FRED. T. DEWOLF.

Mr. J. J. HUGHES:

1. What position does Mr. Fred. T. DeWolf occupy in the military service at Halifax?
2. What is the date of the present appointment?
3. What is the rate of pay and allowance paid him?
4. Was Mr. DeWolf brought from Vancouver to Halifax to perform his duties?
5. If so, were his transportation expenses paid and for what reason?
6. Was the transportation expenses of Mr. DeWolf's family paid by the Militia Department, from Vancouver to Halifax?

Sir EDWARD KEMP:

1. Temporary acting chief recruiting officer for Nova Scotia, with the same rank as he held before the retirement of Major G. B. Cutten, who retired to resume his duties as president of Acadia College. Captain DeWolf had previously been assistant to Major Cutten.

2. 17th August, 1917.

3. Pay and allowance of his rank.

4. No. He came to the recruiting staff from the 1st Canadian Garrison Artillery at Halifax. Captain DeWolf was born in Halifax, January 1869, and, for the most of his life, conducted an extensive business there.

5. Answered by No. 4.

6. Yes.

FORESTRY RECRUITING OFFICERS.

Mr. LANCTOT:

1. Is the Government aware as to whether or not Captain J. F. Belford and Lieutenant-Colonel E. S. Bernard, of Richmond, and Lieutenant R. I. Dean, of Sherbrooke, are recruiting Foresters in the Province of Quebec?
2. If so, is the Government aware as to whether or not posters to the following effect are being circulated in the Province of Quebec:

Foresters wanted.

Men wanted for forestry work in England, Scotland and France.

Pay, separation allowance and bonus is the same as in other branches of the army.

This is the last chance for voluntary enlistment.

Join now. Don't wait for conscription.

This is what you have been waiting for.

Do your bit.

Apply to Captain J. F. Belford, O.C., Richmond, Lieutenant-Colonel E. S. Bernard, Richmond, Lieutenant R. I. Dean, Sherbrooke.

3. Do the said Captain J. F. Belford, Lieutenant-Colonel E. S. Bernard and Lieutenant R. I. Dean speak French?
4. What salary is being paid per day to each of them?
5. What amount, if any, has been paid to them up to date?

Sir EDWARD KEMP:

1, 4 and 5. Yes. Lieut.-Colonel E. S. Bernard, Richmond, is acting in a purely honorary capacity, and receives neither pay nor allowance. In addition, he furnishes his own motor car and pays his own expenses.

Lieut. R. I. Dean, of Sherbrooke, is now attached to Forestry Depot, Military District No. 5, and will receive pay and allowances.

Major J. F. Belford, now officer commanding, Forestry Depot, Military District No. 5, will receive major's pay and allowances.

The amount paid to Major Belford to date is his salary for the month of July, $155; separation allowance at captain's rate, $40.

To Lieut. Dean nothing, and Colonel Bernard nothing.

The total recruiting expenses to this unit, so far, have been less than $500, and over 200 men have been raised, 127 of whom and four officers have gone overseas.

2. The posters referred to have been issued.

3. These officers speak French sufficiently for ordinary purposes.

HOUSE OF COMMONS—ACCOUNTANT'S OFFICE.

Mr. J. E. MARCILE:

1. On what date did the accountant of the House of Commons first occupy the office at the corner of Wellington and Metcalfe Streets?
2. Were these offices under lease to any other party at the time the Government first entered into possession?
3. If so, to whom and at what rental?

4. Was the lease of the former lessee transferred to the Government? If so, on what terms?

5. On what date was the lease signed that expires on the 5th of February, 1918?

6. Did the Government occupy these premises prior to the date of the existing lease? If so, for how long and on what terms?

Mr. REID:

1. 5th February, 1916; owing to destruction of Parliament buildings by fire on 3rd February, it was necessary to have offices at once.

2 and 3. Arrangements for taking these premises was made by Clerk of House of Commons with the Rideau Club at time of fire. The department has no information as to who had lease prior to Government renting said premises from Rideau Club.

4. No.

5. There is no lease. Department of Public Works pays rental at rate of $2,000 per annum.

6. No. The fire was cause of renting, and premises were rented only temporarily, during construction of Parliament buildings.

COLONEL THE REV. A. E. BURKE.

*Mr. FORTIER:

Referring to an item in the Ottawa Citizen of Monday, September 3, 1917, as follows:

"Colonel the Rev. Father Burke has returned from Washington, accompanied by Lieutenant Charles Alverez."

1. Was Rev. Colonel Burke at Washington on official business?

2. If so, has he made a report and will such report be brought down to the House?

3. Has Lieutenant Charles Alverez a commission to, or from, the Canadian Government?

4. If not, what is his business in Canada?

5. What Governments did he and Rev. Colonel Burke represent at Washington?

6. Is the Government to pay the expenses of either, or both, gentlemen going to and returning from Washington?

7. If so, what is the amount of the bills that have been paid or are to be paid?

Mr. MEIGHEN:

1. No.

2. Answered by No. 1.

3. Is a lieutenant in the Canadian Expeditionary Force.

4. Answered by No. 3.

5, 6 and 7. Answered by No. 1.

*Mr. FORTIER:

Has the following item in the New York Tribune of August 31, 1917, been brought to the attention of the Government:

"Lieutenant-Colonel the Right Rev. Monseigneur A. E. Burke, of the Canadian army, returning to the Dominion from a special mission in Cuba, expressed the admiration of the other Allies at the appearance of the parading Guardsmen. He said he had witnessed American troops in training in France and was sure that the men he saw yesterday would be a valuable addition to their number."

2. On what special mission, if any, was Rev. Colonel Burke despatched to Cuba?

3. Has he made a report to the Government?

4. If not, will he make a report and when?

5. If Rev. Colonel Burke has made a report, will it be brought down in the House?

6. Is the Government to defray the travelling expenses of Rev. Colonel Burke to and from Cuba?

7. If so, what would they amount to?

8. Is Rev. Colonel Burke still on the pay list? If so, at what rate is he paid?

Mr. MEIGHEN:

1. No.

2. None.

3, 4, 5, 6 and 7. Answered by No. 2.

8. Colonel Burke is drawing the pay of his rank. He is at present on leave.

*Mr. FORTIER:

1. Has the attention of the Government been directed to the following paragraph in an editorial of the Ottawa Evening Journal of August 29, 1917:

"If the Government is faced with difficulties in the selection of returning officers or presiding officers to take the soldiers' vote, and the Opposition remains suspicious of any appointments made, why not utilize the brigade of chaplains overseas to work out the election machinery?"

2. If so, is it the intention of the Government to act on the suggestion of the Evening Journal?

3. Will Rev. Colonel Dr. A. E. Burke be appointed to take charge of the said returning officers or presiding officers?

4. If not placed in charge, will Rev. Dr. Burke be appointed as one of the said returning officers or presiding officers?

Mr. MEIGHEN:

1. No information.

2, 3 and 4. Answered by No. 1.

*Mr. FORTIER:

1. Is the Government aware that Rev. A. E. Burke has returned to Canada?

2. Has the said Rev. A. E. Burke been provided with an office in the Parliament buildings?

3. If so, has he been entrusted by the Government with any special work, and what is the nature of such work?

4. Does such work, if any, require his consultation with senators and members of Parliament?

Mr. MEIGHEN:

1. Yes.

2. No.

3. No.

4. Answered by No. 3.

MOUNTED POLICE—PENSIONS.

Mr. BUCHANAN:

1. How many retired officers of the Royal Northwest Mounted Police are drawing pensions?

2. What is the pension allowance for officers?

3. In case of the death of a retired officer, does the pension go to his wife and family?

4. What is the amount of pension to non-commissioned officers and men of the Royal Northwest Mounted Police?

5. Does this pension go to the widow and family?

6. Is it the intention of the Government to revise the Royal Northwest Mounted Police Pension Act, in order to provide a better allowance for the men who have served long periods in that force?

Mr. HUGH CLARK:

1. There are 21 retired officers of the Royal Northwest Mounted Police drawing pensions.

2. The pensions to officers and men of the R.N.W.M. Police are governed by the provisions of the Mounted Police Act—Chapter 91 of the Revised Statutes of 1906—Parts II and III, respectively.

Section 43 of the above mentioned Act provides that an officer who is retired compulsorily for any cause other than misconduct, or inefficiency, after twenty years' service, shall be entitled to a pension for life, not exceeding one-fiftieth of the pay and allowances of his rank or permanent appointment at the time of his retirement for each completed year of service.

Section 44 provides that an officer who retires voluntarily after twenty-five years' service shall be entitled to a pension for life, twenty per centum less than he would be entitled to if he were retired compulsorily.

Section 45 provides that an officer who retires voluntarily after thirty-five years' service shall be entitled to the same pension as if he were retired compulsorily.

Section 46 enacts that no addition shall be made to such pension for any service beyond thirty-five years.

3. In the case of the death of a retired officer his pension is not continued to his wife and children, but sections 51 to 54 of the Mounted Police Act provides that the Governor in Council may grant a pension to the widow and a compassionate allowance to each of the children of any officer, who, having completed 20 years' service, was at the time of his death either on full pay or in receipt of a pension.

The amounts of pensions to the widows of officers are as follows:

(a) In the case of the commissioner, $500 per annum.

(b) In the case of an assistant commissioner, $450 per annum.

(c) In the case of a superintendent or surgeon, $350 per annum.

(d) In the case of an inspector, assistant surgeon or veterinary surgeon, $250 per annum.

The compassionate allowances to children are as follows:

(a) In the case of the commissioner or an assistant commissioner, $80 per annum.

(b) In the case of a superintendent or surgeon, $70 per annum.

(c) In the case of an inspector, assistant surgeon or veterinary surgeon, $65 per annum.

(2) If the child is motherless and in great need, the allowance may be doubled.

4. The pensions to non-commissioned officers and constables of the Royal Northwest Mounted Police are governed by Part III of the Mounted Police Act.

Section 66 of the Mounted Police Act provides that the pension to a constable (or non-commissioned officer) on retirement shall be according to the following scale:

(a) If he has completed 15 but less than 21 years service, an annual sum equal to one-fiftieth of his annual pay (not including allowances, as in the case of officers) for each completed year of service.

Note.—Unless a constable or non-commissioned officer is incapacitated by infirmity of mind or body, he is required to serve for 20 years before becoming entitled to a pension.

(b) If he has completed 21 but less than 25 years service, an annual sum equal to twenty-fiftieths of his annual pay (not including allowances), with an addition of two-fiftieths of his annual pay for every completed year of service above twenty years.

(c) If he has completed twenty-five years service, an annual sum equal to thirty-fiftieths of his annual pay (not including allowances) with an addition of one-fiftieth of his annual pay for every completed year of service above twenty-five years; provided that the pension shall not exceed two-thirds of his annual pay at his retirement.

Note.—"Annual pay" as referred to above is deemed, for the purposes of pension for a non-commissioned officer or constable, to be the average amount of pay received by him for the three years preceding retirement, exclusive of extra pay or allowances.

5. In the case of the death of a retired non-commissioned officer or constable, the pension is not continued to his wife and family. No provision is made in the above-mentioned Act for the widow and family of a deceased non-commissioned officer or constable who, at the time of his death, was in receipt of a pension.

6. As already explained above, the pension of an officer of the force is calculated

on his pay and allowances, the latter for the purposes of pension, being fixed by Order in Council, whereas the pension of a constable is calculated on his pay only. The matter of amending the Act to permit of constables' pensions being based on their pay and allowances, as in the case of officers, has received the attention of the department, and it is hoped to deal with this and other amendments at the first suitable opportunity.

LATCHFORD, ONT., PLANT AND BUILDINGS.

*Mr. MURPHY:

1. Did the Public Works Department call for tenders for plant and buildings at Latchford, Ont.?
2. If so, were such tenders received on or about May 15, 1917?
3. How many tenders were received, from whom, and what were the respective amounts thereof?
4. Was the highest tender accepted? If so, what was the amount thereof?
5. If the highest tender was not accepted, to whom were the plant and buildings sold, and at what price?

Mr. REID:

1. Yes.

2. Yes.

3. 7 for plant: The Wabi Iron Works, Limited, $1,454 for all items except Nos. 18-24-28 and 29. Tenderers also quote a bulk price of $1,500 for the whole plant. Fleming Machinery Co., $1,000 for the whole plant. P. M. Fleming, $964 for items 1 to 7 inclusive, 9-12-13-24 and 26. Hendon Lumber Co., Limited, $250 for item No. 1. Conkey and Murphy, $110 for items 3-5-6 and 25. D. McLellan, $25, for items 26 and 32. Thos. Sullivan, $5 for item No. 29. 5 for buildings: The Auld Lumber Company, $200 for items 1 and 5. Conkey and Murphy, $50 for item No. 1. Morrissey and Davies, $45 for item No. 4. Archibald King, $25 for item No. 3. Alex. Mitchell, $25 for item No. 8.

4. Yes, as follows: Plant—The Wabi Iron Works, Limited, for items 7-8-10-11-14-15-16 17-19-20-21-22-23-25-27-28-31 and 32, listed prices total $809. P. M. Fleming, for items 1-2-3-4-5-6-9-12-13-24 and 26, listed prices total $924. Thos. Sullivan, for item 29, $5.

Buildings—The Auld Lumber Co., for item No. 1, $150; The Auld Lumber Co., for item No. 5, $50; Archibald King, for item No. 3, $25; Morrissey and Davies, for item No. 4, $45; Alex. Mitchell, for item No. 8, $25.

5. Highest tenders were accepted.

[Mr. Hugh Clark.]

DR. A. MORTAN.

Mr. McKENZIE:

1. Is Dr. A. Mortan, of Halifax, in the service of the Government?
2. If so, in what capacity or capacities, and when was he appointed?
3. What pay does he receive from each office or position?
4. What is his total salary or allowance?
5. Does he give his whole time to the Government work or is he still attending to private practice?

Mr. ROCHE:

1. Yes.

2. Acting medical superintendent and Immigration Medical Inspector at Halifax during absence overseas of Dr. Rankine. Appointed January 3, 1916.

3. $1,200 per annum.

4. Answered by No. 3.

5. Gives such portion of time as is necessary to attend to departmental duties but is free to attend to private practice.

THE WAR-TIME ELECTIONS ACT.

On the Orders of the Day:

Sir ROBERT BORDEN: I understand that the right hon. leader of the Opposition has some announcement to make as to when the third reading of Bill No. 133, the War-Time Elections Act, may be had. We had some discussion here last evening on that point.

Sir WILFRID LAURIER: I do not know what it was.

Sir ROBERT BORDEN: I understand from a note received from the chief whip that my right hon. friend would say something to me about it.

Sir WILFRID LAURIER: I am sorry that the Government should see fit to move the closure. I have no objection that they should move the closure if they want to do so, but whether they want to do it or not, all we desire is a proper discussion of this Bill. Yesterday, while there was a considerable amount of discussion on section 1, there was practically no discussion upon sections 2 and 3. What we had yesterday, so far as they were concerned, was simply an announcement from the Government of the changes made by this Bill. Whether the closure is moved or not moved, I intend simply to ask for information.

Sir ROBERT BORDEN: What I suggested yesterday to my hon. friends opposite was that we are perfectly ready to give to-day, to-morrow and Friday for discussion of this Bill in committee provided that we could have an assurance that the

third reading would be taken not later than Saturday. There has been one day in committee already. We purpose giving three more, which would seem to me to be ample for all the discussion that would be required in committee. That would bring the third reading on Saturday. It is perfectly true that Saturday is a very inconvenient day, but I thought, under the circumstances, as we have been here for about eight months, including the vacation, that hon. gentlemen on both sides of the House, who live near Ottawa and who usually go home on Saturdays and Sundays, might be willing to stay on this one occasion in order that we might expedite the business of the House. It seems to me that the proposal I made for three more days' discussion of this Bill was a reasonable one, and that we might have the vote on Saturday. Further than that, I said last night, and I repeat again, that we are willing to sit as late in the evening as may be desired, and I am also willing to commence mornings sessions to-morrow in order to give further time for discussion.

Sir WILFRID LAURIER: My hon. friend must realize that it is not conducive to the making of agreements to have them offered under threat. We are told that we are to do this or we are to have the closure. So far as I am concerned, I do not intend to prolong the discussion one minute more than is necessary for a thorough understanding of the Bill. Under such circumstances I will not make any agreement whatever, and if my right hon. friend will not be satisfied with that, I cannot say more. I have no intention at all to prolong the discussion.

Sir ROBERT BORDEN: I am sorry that, under the circumstances, my right hon. friend leaves me no alternative except to make the motion. I did not make the proposal to him in the sense of any threat. I discussed it last night, not in that sense at all, as hon. gentlemen opposite, I think will bear me out. I was endeavouring to place before my right hon. friend what I thought was an exceedingly reasonable proposal so far as the further discussion of the Bill in committee is concerned. I beg to move:

> That the consideration of sections 1, 2, 3, 4 and 5, and of the schedule and title of Bill No. 133, The War-Time Elections Act, shall be the first business of the committee and shall not further be postponed.

Mr. PUGSLEY: Mr. Speaker, with the leave of the Chair, I beg to say that this motion should be given in committee.

Sir ROBERT BORDEN: I will move it in committee. I think my hon. friend is right.

THE HOUSE IN COMMITTEE ON THE WAR-TIME ELECTIONS ACT—RULE 17B APPLIED.

House again in committee on Bill No. 133, The War-time Elections Act.—Sir Robert Borden—Mr. Rainville in the Chair.

Sir ROBERT BORDEN: I beg to move:

> That the consideration of sections 1, 2, 3 4 and 5, and of the schedule and title of Bill No. 133, The War-Time Elections Act, shall be the first business of the committee and shall not further be postponed.

Motion declared carried: Yeas, 43; nays, 25.

Mr. A. K. MACLEAN: I desire to ask a question before we proceed with the Bill. Is the asking of a question equivalent to a 20-minute speech? If one asks a question, may he afterwards speak?

Sir GEORGE FOSTER: You have to take 20 minutes to ask it.

Sir ROBERT BORDEN: A member of the House has always the right to ask a question.

Mr. PUGSLEY: If a member is on his feet once that is all the right he has.

Mr. A. K. MACLEAN: I would like to inquire of the Government if they have any statement to make regarding the exclusion of the relatives of those engaged in the naval forces in Canada. An answer was promised yesterday.

Mr. HAZEN: Perhaps I had better give a short statement of fact in committee in regard to what constitutes the naval forces of Canada. The Naval Service Act of 1910 defines naval forces:

> "Naval forces" means those naval forces organized for the defence and protection of the Canadian coasts and trade, or engaged, as the Governor in Council may from time to time direct.

There are employed under that definition in the naval forces of Canada about 3,882 men altogether: on the east coast 2,028, on the west coast 652, and in the overseas division, that is Canadians, men enlisted in the Canadian navy serving overseas with the British navy chiefly, 1,202.

Speaking briefly, the term would include all men on vessels that fly the white ensign and are at present engaged in the Naval Service. That would not include vessels that are engaged in the fisheries protection fleet, as the men on those vessels do not come within the definition of Naval Service given in this Act, nor would it include the cadets at the Royal

Naval College at Halifax. But it would include those who have enlisted as boys in the Navy under the provisions of the Act, and whose nominal ages are from fourteen to eighteen, but in fact and practice from sixteen to eighteen years. In addition to that, there are some men who have been sworn and enlisted as members of the Naval Service who are doing work on shore at the dockyards, and certain civil work. I understand that the suggestion has been made that it might be desirable to draw some distinction between the men who are actually serving in what is commonly understood as the Navy and those who are doing shore work. It might be possible to make that distinction if desired, just as a distinction is drawn in the military forces between men serving in Canada and those serving overseas.

The qualification which is provided in the Order in Council of September 1st, 1917, regarding the three months' pay given to officers and men on retiring from the Naval Service, has as one of its conditions that the men shall have served continuously for not less than six months during the present war in a sea-going ship, or have served overseas during the present war in the Royal Naval Canadian Volunteer Reserve, Overseas Division. The definition of service in a sea-going ship is "Service in a ship of war, not being a depot ship for wharf or harbour service only."

In regard to the boys to whom I have referred I might say that there are less than two hundred of them who have regularly enrolled and enlisted. Their ages, though nominally from fourteen to eighteen, are as a matter of fact from sixteen to eighteen, because we find that very few boys under sixteen enlist for overseas service. The total number enrolled in the Naval Service is about 3882, of whom 1202 are serving overseas on ships of His Britannic Majesty.

Mr. A. K. MACLEAN: Am I correct in assuming that men engaged in mine sweeping and harbour work are not included?

Mr. HAZEN: The men engaged in mine sweeping and patrol are members of the Naval Service. The service they are engaged in is in some cases of a very dangerous character, and is essential to our part in the war. These men are enrolled and form part of the Naval Service.

Mr. A. K. MACLEAN: Does the Government intend enfranchising these? The Secretary of State promised last evening to advise us about this.

Mr. MEIGHEN: I have made inquiries as to the nature of their occupation. In the first place, we are not enfranchising these men at all by this Bill. They are enfranchised under the Military Voters' Act. All that this Bill does is to divide those of female sex into voters and non-voters, and there is of course no reason at all why the female relatives should be debarred simply on account of the age of these boys, for the female relatives are just as old, no matter how old the boys are. These boys are engaged in war work of a character analogous to that of the men overseas. I understand there is considerable peril attached to it, although it is true that so far they have been successful in avoiding it.

Mr. A. K. MACLEAN: Where is the peril?

Mr. MEIGHEN: My information is that they use dynamite. Mine sweeping is always a more or less dangerous occupation. We cannot distinguish between different classes of war work for the sake of this Bill. It would appear to me to be utterly illogical to do so as long as the men are not engaged around our own shores, where, of course, conditions are quite different. These men are engaged in active service in connection with the war, and there is a measure of peril attached to their occupation.

Mr. A. K. MACLEAN: What about those who are working on shore in the Naval Service?

Mr. MEIGHEN: That is where we make a distinction. It may be that there is some degree of danger even there, but we have to draw the line somewhere.

Mr. A. K. MACLEAN: Why not exclude all those in the Naval Service who ordinarily are engaged in Canadian waters? Why should the female relatives of a man who happens to be employed on a little tug boat or gasoline launch in Halifax harbour be entitled to vote? I hope the minister will drop this altogether.

Mr. MEIGHEN: We are not entitling these men to vote by this Bill. Whatever rights these men now have as regards voting, they have by reason of the Military Voters' Bill. It may be that so far there has been no loss in this particular service, but it would be very bold indeed for Parliament to assume that those men were engaged in a peaceful occupation akin to work on

land. We do not know at what hour it may become the most perilous of occupations. My information from the department is that the service has certainly not been free from peril.

Mr. A. K. MACLEAN: The mine sweepers in Halifax harbour work only two hours a day, and their occupation cannot be described as dangerous.

Mr. MEIGHEN: I do not know much about it myself, but I made inquiries in the department, and I have given the information I got.

There were several other inquiries I promised to answer to-day. First of all, I will take the meaning of the word "demobilization." I have had the following memorandum prepared:

> The meaning of the word "demobilization" is not given or referred to in any of the legal authorities which I have been able to consult, with the exception of a definition given in 13 Cyc, where it is said that it means "in military law, the dismissal of an army or body of troops from active service." He refers to Rapalje and L. L. Dict. as his authority for this definition.
>
> In the Century Dictionary the meaning given to it somewhat accords with this definition. The meaning there given is "the act of disbanding troops; the reduction of military armaments to a peace footing; the condition of being demobilized, and not liable to be moved on service."

It seems to me that this all taken together is just what every one has understood by demobilization—the release from military obligations—and the moment our overseas soldiers are released from the obligation they assumed as such in our expeditionary forces, at that moment demobilization has taken place.

Sir WILFRID LAURIER: The Bill says "complete demobilization," that is, the cessation of operations, or the withdrawal of the troops from practical operations. Of course you might withdraw one corps after another.

Mr. MEIGHEN: My own opinion is it would be just the same. I do not know how we could word it to meet that difficulty. I presume it would be possible to keep ten men mobilized.

Sir WILFRID LAURIER: But, it is a feature of all legislation that even an ordinary expression is defined. I had hoped my hon. friend would have given the definition of the words "complete demobilization."

Mr. MEIGHEN: Without an interpretation at all, the meaning would be just the meaning we would give by an interpretation, namely, the release of the members of the overseas forces from their obligations as such. That is just the effect of it as it is.

Mr. MARCIL: Is it not a fact that these men are all engaged for the period of the war, or until six months after the war?

Mr. MEIGHEN: My information is, that that is the condition of the voluntary enlistment.

Mr. MARCIL: Will you keep those men six months after the war?

Mr. MEIGHEN: Personally, I do not see how they can get home within six months. Steps may have to be taken to keep them on the force until we can bring them home.

Sir WILFRID LAURIER: We may understand then that complete demobilization means the release of all the troops from active service, whether they are in Europe or whether they have returned.

Mr. MEIGHEN: Yes. Release from their obligations as members of the expeditionary force. Of course we would not release them overseas.

The next question was as to whether this Act would be applicable to by-elections. I have looked into the matter very carefully, and in my opinion if a by-election should become necessary while this Act is in operation, that is, before demobilization, this Act is applicable, and should be applicable. It is true the Military Voters' Act is not applicable. They would not have a vote in any by-election, but it is much better that this Act should be in effect rather than that the old Act should be in effect. As a matter of fact, the old Franchise Act would scarcely apply at all in some provinces. Reference to sections 52, 214 and 218 of the Act as it will be when this Act is passed, will show this Act is clearly applicable. Section 52 of the Act as it stands reads:

> 52. Except as provided in this part, it shall not be necessary to prepare new voters' lists for the purpose of any election to be held under this Act, when there has been in the said electoral district a previous election, the voters' lists prepared for which are of record in the office of the Clerk of the Crown in Chancery, and there is an interval of less than twelve months between the dates of the writs for the two elections.

So that, for any election held within one year the voters' lists prepared under this Act and in the possession of the Clerk of the Crown in Chancery would be the lists. Section 214 says:

214. The returning officer shall also transmit to the Clerk of the Crown in Chancery, the writ, with his return, the stamp furnished him for stamping the ballot papers, and all the ballot papers including those unused, the original statements of the several deputy returning officers, together with the lists of voters and the poll books used in the several polling divisions, and all other lists and documents used or furnished for the election, or which have been transmitted to him by the deputy returning officers.

That section provides that the Clerk of the Crown in Chancery shall keep those lists.

Mr. NESBITT: That is in the present Act?

Mr. MEIGHEN: In the Act as it stands now, and as it will stand. Section 218 provides:

218. The Clerk of the Crown in Chancery shall, subject to the provisions of this Act, retain in his possession the papers transmitted to him by any returning officer, with the return, for at least one year, if the election is not contested during that time, and, if the election is contested, then for one year after the termination of such contestation.

So this Act will be applicable in the event of an election within one year.

Mr. MARCIL: Will the soldiers on the other side vote in that by-election?

Mr. MEIGHEN: No, the Military Voters' Act is not applicable.

The next subject is with regard to relatives of members of the Allied armies. I cannot add to what I said yesterday on this point. I think it would open the door to the gravest abuses. While I freely admit there are some whom it would be in the public interest to admit to the franchise, still we cannot distinguish between Allies in the war. We are very anxious to avoid distinguishing, and the difficulty in drawing the line is so great that I think it is better to leave the Bill as it is in that regard.

Mr. GRAHAM: What about the ten days?

Mr. MEIGHEN: I will deal with that in a minute. The hon. member for Saskatoon urged very strongly that we should extend the time backwards, that is, make the dates earlier upon which the voters' lists should be posted by the enumerators in the polling division, also the time within which the enumerator would add to or strike from the voters' list after that. Under the Bill as introduced, the first time was ten days, and the last three days before the election. In the former Acts it was eight days and two days. After a thorough review of the Act I prepared amendments which will have the effect of making the dates twelve and five, instead of ten and three. The enumerator will have to post his lists twelve days before the election, and the lists must be complete, so far as the enumerator makes them, five days before the election.

Mr. C. A. WILSON: Why not make it fifteen?

Mr. MEIGHEN: We cannot.

Mr. NESBITT: Does that refer to Ontario as well?

Mr. MEIGHEN: It refers to Ontario as well, in so far as the enumerator makes the lists in Ontario.

Mr. NESBITT: Twelve days before the elections?

Mr. MEIGHEN: Yes.

Mr. NESBITT: And, five days to appeal?

Mr. MEIGHEN: He posts the lists twelve days before the election. He is supposed to have them as complete as he can get them. Until five days before the election he sits for two hours each day, and he is obliged, if any one convinces him that the list so posted is wrong, to add to it or to take off a name that he deems should be taken off, but after five days before the election he cannot do that. All he can do is to give a man a certificate on election day which enables him to cast his vote, or to give him a refusal which enables him to tender his vote, which vote is placed in an envelope and deposited in the ballot box.

Mr. NESBITT: If the minister looks at paragraph 65 (a) of the Act, clause 3, line 34, he will see what I mean:

If the enumerator refuses or omits to enter upon the list the name of any person the applicant may, in person or in the case of a qualified person who may be absent from the polling division at the time of the enumeration, an elector in the polling division acting on such absent person's behalf, may within three days after the posting up by the enumerator of such list, appeal to such Board.

That is what I asked my hon. friend about last night. I want that extended to five days.

Mr. MEIGHEN: I will try and look into that during the afternoon. That is in the province of Ontario?

Mr. NESBITT: In the cities.

Mr. MEIGHEN: That applies to the cities only?

Mr. NESBITT: Yes.

Mr. MEIGHEN: Well that is another subject.

Mr. NESBITT: The Act just gives three days to correct the voters' lists, and I want my hon. friend to give us five days.

Mr. MEIGHEN: I will try to see if it can be done. I find that since we met a calculation has been made, and I am informed that we can make the twelve days fifteen days. That meets the request which was made by the hon. member for South Renfrew (Mr. Graham). The dates will be twelve, fifteen and five, whereas previously they were eight and two.

Mr. TURRIFF: This, in so far as it applies to Saskatchewan, is practically the same law as we have been working under since 1896 in so far as Dominion elections are concerned. Instead of making the provisions that my hon. friend is making—and I realise that they are made for the protection of the Opposition—it would be better to make another change and follow the old system. My suggestion would be that in all cities of 5,000 and over in the West there should be a judicial revision of the lists during the fifteen days prior to the election. In so far as the rural polls are concerned, we would prefer that the law which we have had since 1896 should remain in force. There is practically no effort made in the rural districts to bring in doubtful voters who will take an oath and secure a ballot and vote when they are not entitled to. In the rural parts we never have had any difficulty along those lines. But in the cities it is quite possible that there will be trouble. I would suggest that in cities the judicial revision be made before the election instead of after and thus avoid the necessity of putting so many ballots in the envelope. We have never had that system in Saskatchewan in connection with Dominion elections. But I can see where an unscrupulous scrutineer or enumerator might easily tie up such a large number of votes as to make it very difficult for the candidate to bring the men concerned forward and have their ballots counted in a recount. In rural districts I do not think any revision is necessary at all. The Act worked well in the past, and the fact that no man can be denied his right to vote has always been a safeguard. It is proposed in this Bill that a man whose name is not on the list can go up, take the oath, get his ballot and vote. I do not think any one need be afraid that in so far as the rural polls are concerned any wrong-doing will take place under that system. If my hon. friend could see his way clear to making the change I suggest it will prevent a great deal of work and bother after the election in the event of a recount, and it will certainly make it easier for the enumerators and the officials carrying out the election.

Mr. MEIGHEN: I have finished the answers to the notes I made yesterday. Included in them was a reference to the subject introduced again by the hon. member for Assiniboia (Mr. Turriff). The principle of this distinction is quite sound. There is undoubtedly more difficulty in cities than in the rural parts. There is no possibility of either plugging or disfranchisement in the rural parts of the country. In the cities it is different. But we were faced with this difficulty, that in the three western provinces there is no machinery for this revision. In Ontario, where we adopt it, there is the provincial machinery already established and in operation, and it is a very complicated matter to establish new machinery and to fit it to the needs of individual provinces. We set about, then, to avoid the necessity of doing that because we thought it could be avoided without taking any very great risks. The posting up of the lists so long a time before election day and the virtual closing of the lists five days before election day will be a very great protection in itself. Secondly, the judicial revision afterwards is an enormous protection and the one that I chiefly rely on. In that connection, there is a great deal in what the hon. member says, namely, that an unscrupulous scrutineer acting for a candidate might make the opposing candidate's position difficult if he were ready to challenge a great number of voters who should not be challenged. But, we have put this check upon that: Hereafter voters cannot be challenged in the ordinary way, as they are in the provincial elections in Alberta, merely by a challenge. We do not allow that. The scrutineer must take his oath that he believes that a man has no right to vote, that he believes the cause and the cause must be sufficient to disfranchise. I think scrutineers will hesitate before they expose themselves to the risk of going before a judge under cross-examination with affidavits in their faces that were manifestly false. They will have to go and show that they have ground for the affidavit and I think that scrutineers will hesitate a long time, and will be advised to hesitate by

the candidate, before they take any step of that kind. In the first place, they must go to the extent of perjuring themselves, and in the next place they must perjure themselves with the certain knowledge that they will very shortly be brought before the judge to answer for their perjury. If we were to apply the suggestion of the hon. gentleman to the cities of the West, it would delay the election campaign for a very considerable time. After a very thorough review of the circumstances, it was decided that we would adopt the safeguards that we have adopted and put the whole of the West on the same footing.

Mr. MARCIL: We are to have the enumerators in the rural parts of Quebec. Will the minister kindly explain how the system will work out there in a rural constituency?

Mr. MEIGHEN: Judicial revision in the rural parts would be out of the question because it could not be done within the time. The only work in Quebec that has not yet been reviewed judicially is the work of the enumerators, and that will be very easily tested as it applies only to the question whether a woman has a brother or son overseas, or whether a German or Austrian immigrant has been naturalized since 1902.

Mr. MARCIL: If five women were placed on the list in my county it would be difficult to trace them within the fifteen days provided. They might not reside in the constituency at all.

Mr. MEIGHEN: But under the Bill they must.

Mr. KYTE: Does the provision as to the completion of the enumerators work fifteen days before election day apply all over Canada?

Mr. MEIGHEN: Yes.

Mr. KYTE: And also the requirement that the objection of a scrutineer to a vote on election day must be supported by affidavit?

Mr. MEIGHEN: Yes.

Mr. BUREAU: Must enumerators reside in the district for which they are appointed?

Mr. MEIGHEN: I do not think there is any restriction on residence, but in practice only a resident of the district could do the work.

[Mr. Meighen.]

Mr. BUREAU: The word "municipality" has a different meaning in other provinces from its meaning in Quebec. With us the boundaries of a municipality are coextensive with those of the parish and of the school district. Would it not be well to say in section 42 "may appoint enumerators residing within the municipality in the province of Quebec or in the neighbouring municipality?"

Mr. MEIGHEN: I do not think there would be objection to that, although I would rather not amend it as I think it will work out in that way.

Mr. McCRANEY: Under the law as it now stands, lists of voters must be posted one day before nomination day, so that when the candidates are placed in the field there is a list of voters upon which to go. Under this Bill the lists will be posted up only during the last fifteen days
4 p.m. of the twenty-eight days in which the candidates are in nomination, so that there will be thirteen days in which there will be no lists and during which candidates will be in the field. I suggest a further extension of that time. When candidates are in the field the lists ought to be available. Then who are the persons qualified to nominate a candidate for Parliament? They are persons who are on the enumeration list. Are you not going to change the whole basis of your nomination? To-day the candidate is nominated one week before election day, and he is nominated by so many qualified electors, that is those whose names have been posted up the day before in a public place.

Mr. MEIGHEN: Not necessarily; he simply needs to be qualified. Being entitled to go on the list would be a qualification.

Mr. McCRANEY: The existing provision is that each enumerator, the day before nomination day, posts up two copies of the list in conspicuous places, one I think in the post office and another in a conspicuous place. There is no provision for the case of lists being torn down. That sometimes happens in rural districts. Lists disappear. They are posted on the outside of buildings. Has that point been covered so that the public will have before them continuously the lists? Under the new provision giving fifteen days for the posting up of the lists, there will be candidates definitely in the field before any lists are available. There is no provision under the old law for the delivery of copies of the enumerators'

lists to candidates, because the candidates are nominated the day after the lists go up. The Secretary of State is providing that candidates shall be in the field 13 days before the lists go up. I ask him to provide that the enumerator in each polling division give a copy of the enumeration list to each of the candidates. Most of these lists are typewritten and a number of copies can easily be made.

Mr. MEIGHEN: The hon. gentleman suggests that if the lists are not completed a man cannot qualify as nominator or candidate. The Act says that a certain number of electors may nominate a candidate. An elector is defined as one entitled to vote.

Mr. McCRANEY: In this case he would not be entitled to vote, because his name would not be on the enumerator's list.

Mr. MEIGHEN: He would be entitled to vote if he was a qualified voter. A man may be entitled to vote, even though he is not on the list.

Mr. CARVELL: Suppose two candidates are nominated and objection is taken against one on the ground that he has not been nominated by 25 duly qualified electors of his riding. The returning officer is called upon to decide whether or not the man has been properly nominated. If he decides that the candidate was not properly nominated, that is the end of the election. If he decides that the candidate was properly nominated, the election shall proceed. In the Maritime Provinces, Quebec, and Ontario there are lists from which the names of 25 qualified voters could be selected. But where there are no lists, how is the returning officer to decide whether he is justified in coming to the conclusion that the candidate has been properly nominated?

Mr. MEIGHEN: The Election Act sets forth the qualifications and disqualifications of voters; he would have to judge from that.

Mr. McCRANEY: In that case he would have to examine into the qualification of every man whose name appeared on the nomination paper. Formerly there was no occasion for that because the enumeration list was posted up, and that was prima facie evidence—

Mr. MEIGHEN: The returning officer always has to do that. Possibly he obtains the necessary information by simply examining the list. Now, however, he may have to decide whether on that nomination paper there are 25 men duly entitled to vote—subject, of course, to whatever judicial review there may be afterwards. That task may be slightly more difficult than it was before, but I do not think that any candidate would have difficulty in seeing to it that there were on his nomination paper at least 25 who were qualified to vote. As to the second point raised by my hon. friend regarding the necessity for provision against the tearing down of the lists, section 258 of the Act as it now stands, and as it will stand, provides severe penalties for such an offence. As to the furnishing of copies, I think that the hon. gentleman's suggestion is a reasonable one. There is no difficulty now about getting the lists to the candidates. I have asked that an amendment be prepared to provide that the enumerators shall furnish each candidate with a list.

Mr. CARVELL: I have read this Bill through with a great deal of care; I spent an hour this morning in my room trying to digest it. I do not understand how in the world the thing is going to be worked out. In the first place you appoint as enumerator some political friend.

Mr. MEIGHEN: The Bill does not say that.

Mr. CARVELL: That is what it means; the man appointed as enumerator will be the most offensive partisan in the district. I know what I am talking about so far as New Brunswick is concerned. Part 2 of the Act was put in our hands only at half-past three this afternoon, and after trying to digest it the best way I can I find that this partisan goes round and makes up his list privately. We have nothing to say about it; we are not entitled to be represented. Ten days before the election—I believe the minister is going to make it fifteen—the lists are put up. The enumerator gives notice that he is going to sit somewhere two hours each day—it may be in his kitchen—and he is to say whether this person shall be added to or that person removed from the list. Why not provide that an affidavit or declaration shall be necessary upon which the enumerator must act? I can pick out the men in my county who will be enumerators—men who for ten years deliberately kept on the list persons who never resided in New Brunswick. They brought these men across the boundary line in automobiles, rushed them to the polls, perjured them and then sent them back to the United States. These men have been the revisers of our lists in

New Brunswick in many cases. Thank God a change has been made and these men no longer have the right to make the lists. Now my hon. friend is putting into the hands of these same people the right to make up the lists—and the Lord help any Liberal candidate who is trying to run in some portions of New Brunswick if these people have that right. If you provided that the municipal authorities should make the list, then you would have a board of three men and you would get justice. Or if you provided that the enumerator should take the affidavit of the applicant or of some other person that the party is or is not entitled to be added to the list, the condition would not be so bad. But it is wrong to leave it to the ipse dixit of this person whether a man shall or shall not go on the list. Worse than that: this man gives notice that he is going to sit some place on election day—and that place is just as liable to be five miles away as it is to be at the polling booth. He sits there and he has the right to make voters all day long. A woman comes in, tells her story, and if he wants to do so he gives her a certificate that she has the right to vote. If he does not want to give her such a certificate he gives a certificate of refusal and when she votes her ballot is placed in an envelope. The matter is absolutely in the hands of this partisan who sits as judge on election day.

Mr. MEIGHEN: Subject to appeal.

Mr. CARVELL: What is the good of an appeal? If the enumerator has a suspicion the woman will vote as he wants her to, he gives her the necessary certificate; in that case her ballot goes into the box and is counted. But if he does not want her to get the vote, he gives her a certificate of refusal, form W-2 in the Bill. On that certificate she has the right to vote, but her vote does not go into the ballot box; it goes into an envelope. Later on, if a candidate is willing to put up $2,000 or $3,000 to thresh the matter out before a judge, she will probably have her vote counted. Otherwise she cannot get it. This system may work out in the West where the people know something about it, but this is the most horrible piece of legislation, so far as elections in eastern Canada are concerned, that has ever been proposed in my day. I am not drawing up any fanciful objections. During the last nine years there has never been in my constituency an election in which men, who do not reside in New Brunswick, and who have no right to vote, have not been kept on the list. They have been brought over from the United States in automobiles, or in trains in the winter time, and voted, then they have been immediately whisked away. As there was not a Liberal magistrate in the county, you could not arrest those men. Dozens and dozens of votes have been stolen in that way in every election during the last nine years.

Mr. W. H. BENNETT: Who has made up this list that, according to the hon. gentleman, is such an infamous one?

Mr. CARVELL: Tory politicians.

Mr. W. H. BENNETT: What particular Tory politician makes up the list in each county in New Brunswick?

Mr. CARVELL: One of them who is appointed by the Government, is the chairman of the board. What that man cannot do about voters' lists is in many cases, not worth knowing. I am giving actual facts. In the local election of 1912 in New Brunswick we deliberately challenged, at one polling division, either eight or nine men who did not reside in New Brunswick and had not resided in that province for years, but whose names had been kept on the lists. They took the oath and voted, and then took an automobile and got out of the country inside of two hours, and there was no way of getting at them.

Mr. W. H. BENNETT: Who are the officials other than the sheriff?

Mr. CARVELL: I did not say the sheriff.

Mr. W. H. BENNETT: I thought the sheriff was one.

Mr. CARVELL: I would trust the sheriff, no matter whether he was a Liberal or a Conservative. We have Liberal sheriffs and Conservative sheriffs. We have had them under both regimes. So far as sheriffs are concerned, we have not been treated very badly. I would trust any sheriff in New Brunswick to make up a list. If my hon. friend could devise some means of appointing sheriffs in New Brunswick, I would be perfectly satisfied.

Mr. W. H. BENNETT: I was asking the hon. gentleman for information, because I do not know who makes up those lists. Who are the three officials?

Mr. CARVELL: The lists are made up by the two municipal councillors of the parish. I suppose that would correspond with what you call a municipality in Ontario. The word "municipality" in my

province means a county. There are a number of parishes corresponding to townships, and there are two men elected usually biannually, who are called county councillors and those two men, together with a third man appointed by the Government, make up the voters' lists for that parish. Those two men are usually pretty fair men, because they represent the people, but the trouble is with the third man appointed by the Government. He is the chairman of the board, and no list is of any value unless it is signed by him. The other two men might make up a perfect list, but if the chairman does not want to sign it, it is of no value. That practically means that the list is made up by the chairman appointed by the Government.

Mr. W. H. BENNETT: What time of the year was that list made up last?

Mr. CARVELL: October, 1916.

Mr. W. H. BENNETT: Will that be the list to be used in New Brunswick in the coming election if it is held before December?

Mr. CARVELL: That will be the list on which the coming election will be held if the election is held at any time before the second or third day of March.

Mr. W. H. BENNETT: Will that list be generally acceptable so far as fairness is concerned?

Mr. CARVELL: Yes it is the law of the land, and we shall take it.

Mr. W. H. BENNETT: What is the complaint then?

Mr. CARVELL: I do not know what my hon. friend is speaking about. I am not finding fault with the list. It is there. It is made up by Tory officials, and we have to take it. If the election were held after the third day of March, we would have a much more honest list, but we have to take it as it is. What I am speaking about is that you are going to appoint those Tory partisans as enumerators, and they are the ones who are going to make up the female suffrage list. Those enumerators will play a very small part in the Maritime Provinces so far as disqualifying people is concerned. because, in my constituency at all events, I do not think there is a solitary voter who could be disqualified by any enumerator no matter how badly he might want to act. There may possibly be some of those Danish voters to whom I referred last evening. I do not know how many of them or if any of them came from Schleswig-Holstein. If any of them came from there after it was ceded to Germany, then I am afraid some of those men might be disfranchised. I think there are very few of them in the Maritime Provinces. What I am afraid of in regard to these enumerators is the making up of the list of the female voters. I would like to see some safeguard thrown around the matter. I do not like to see a partisan appointed who has the power to make this list in camera. No man has any right to go near him in order to find out what he is doing, until fifteen days before the election when he posts up his list and says: That is my handiwork. I can go to him and produce the most solemn affidavit in the world and prove to him that he has added to that list names which he should not have added or that he has refrained from adding names which he should have added, but I have no redress, and I cannot make him remedy the matter at all. There should be some appeal or some person to whom one could go in order to get justice. My only object in referring to some of the conditions which prevailed in the past is to show the Solicitor General the conditions of affairs we have fought against, and having fought against them, and having won out and having reached a point at which we can get an honest list, we in New Brunswick feel very sore that we have to go back to the old system, and that the supplementary list has to be handed over to a partisan from whose decision there is no appeal. There is no way of compelling an enumerator to add to the list that which he should add or to strike out from the list that which he should strike out. That is what I am finding fault with. If the Secretary of State does not want to take the revising board—and the chairman of the revising board will now be a Liberal—let him cut them out. Let him take somebody. Let him take the sheriff. If he would have an appeal to the sheriff of the county—and in my county there are two, one a Liberal and the other a Conservative—I would be perfectly satisfied to take either one. Let him make them the arbitrators or court of appeal, and they would make up an honest list.

Mr. DAVIDSON: Under the New Brunswick system is there any appeal?

Mr. CARVELL: No, there is not. At the next session of the legislature, the whole law will be changed. The legislature was not able to meet on account of the old Government not resigning until the month of May. The legislature passed only the smallest quantity of legislation absolutely

necessary to carry on the affairs of the province. It is the intention of the Government to change entirely the method of making up the lists in New Brunswick. They will either change it over entirely, or they will provide an appeal from the board of revisers to some official, probably the county court judge, or something of that kind. As it is to-day, there is no doubt in the world that in New Brunswick there is no appeal whatever, and it means that practically what that chairman of the board of revisers says, goes, and that is the end of the matter. If we are going to enfranchise the women—and that has my hearty consent, except that they should all be enfranchised—there should be some appeal from the ipse dixit of this enumerator in order to get justice. As I said before, I would be willing to leave the matter to the sheriff.

An hon. MEMBER: Time

Mr. CARVELL: If my hon. friends want to call time, all right. I understand that the rule is being adhered to.

Sir ROBERT BORDEN: Go ahead.

Mr. CARVELL: That is the big objection I have to this Bill. I also object very strongly to the enfranchisement of the female relatives of a man who happens to own a little motor boat on the Atlantic coast, and has enough political pull to get the Government to hire it from him. Nineteen-twentieths of all the little motor boats that the Minister of Marine and Fisheries talks of as being engaged in this dangerous service are being paid an exorbitant rate per day as a matter of political pull; that is what it amounts to, and nothing else. I have here a letter written by the Department of Naval Service to a Mr. Calder, of Wilson's Beach, New Brunswick. This man had a motor boat thoroughly equipped in every respect. He was crazy to get the Government to take it off his hands, and put it up to the Minister of Marine and Fisheries, but he was a Liberal, and therefore his boat was no good and could not be used. His neighbour, who hapened to be a Conservative, rented his boat to the Government. All the little gasolene launches along the Atlantic coast are taken by the Minister of Marine and Fisheries if they belong to men of the proper political stripe, and their owners are paid an enormous rate per day, and become members of the Canadian Navy. It simply means that the Government are enfranchising the female relatives of every Tory along the Atlantic coast who owns a motor boat, and they are refusing the franchise to everybody else because they are not able to get in on the inside and lease their boats to the Government. I have another letter which I am willing to let the minister have if he wants it—I have a whole lot of correspondence from this gentleman, in fact—pointing out how this Canadian Naval Service is working out, that all it means is that no man can possibly rent his boat to the Government unless he belongs to the proper political stripe. That is why I raised this question yesterday. Why should the female relatives of the man who happens to rent a motor boat to the Government have a vote in Canada, while the female relatives of the soldier who has enlisted, but has not yet gone across the water, have not a vote. It is simply a method of giving the vote to the female relatives of the leading Conservatives in the Maritime Provinces, and that is all there is to it. I protest most strongly against it.

When this Bill was introduced the Secretary of State stated that he would be glad to receive suggestions. We have been offering suggestions right along, not during a long period, I admit, because we only started yesterday afternoon, but we have been trying to point out the iniquities of this Bill and endeavouring to show how it can be improved, but our suggestions have not met with very much success. It looks to me as if the Government have made up their minds to let this thing go through as it is, and let the axe fall at two o'clock. I admit they have the power, but what is the use of offering suggestions under those circumstances? However, we must do our duty, and offer such suggestions as we think will improve the Bill.

Mr. MEIGHEN: Several suggestions have been accepted.

Mr. CARVELL: I fail to see any of any importance.

Mr. MEIGHEN: Ask the hon. member for Saskatoon and the hon. member for Oxford.

Mr. CARVELL: I am not going into the details because I have not time, and I am not discussing the principle of the measure now, as I may have something to say about that on the third reading of the Bill. I am now simply pointing out the objections I have to the working out of the Bill. Unless some change is made in this provision for enumerators, I can tell my hon. friend that, so far as the Maritime Provinces are concerned, there will be more trouble in eastern Canada than he has ever heard in his lifetime. They have had their troubles

in western Canada. I am not saying that one party is any better or any worse than the other. But whenever you give to a political partisan the right to draw up a voters' list and make him the sole arbiter, there is bound to be injustice, and there is sure to be trouble in the end.

I do not see why the minister could not adopt some method, so far as eastern Canada is concerned at all events, of appealing from the decision of the enumerators. Let some man set the enumerator right if he is wrong. If that is done, then, so far as the working out of the Act is concerned, we will be satisfied. But if it is left entirely to the enumerator, an injustice is bound to be done in certain portions of eastern Canada.

Mr. MARCIL: I cannot understand why the Government are providing for these enumerators. I question very much if it will be an improvement on the system we have at the present time in the province of Quebec. As I pointed out the other day, the secretary treasurer of the municipality prepares the lists. He knows every man, woman and child in the municipality, knows all their circumstances and everything about them. He submits the lists to the municipal council, which represents the people, both Liberals and Tories, and is therefore a non-political body. Why should not the secretary-treasurer of the municipalities in the province of Quebec be empowered to prepare the lists? He has a list already and all he would have to do would be to strike off the aliens who are disqualified under this Bill and add the names of the women whom this Bill enfranchises. He is the most competent man in the municipality for the work and his list could be submitted to the municipal council for ratification. If it was found that he had made a mistake, the municipal council could have it rectified at once. The municipal council, in case objection was taken to the secretary-treasurer's list, could act as an appeal tribunal, to sustain or overrule the decision of the secretary-treasurer. But if the lists are to be prepared by enumerators, one of them could come into a municipality and ask for the existing list and keep that list in his possession until ten days before polling day, when he could issue a new list. I am sure that no member from the province of Quebec would declare this to be an improvement on the system we now have. The people are not used to that way of preparing the lists, and if the minister insists on this method, he is simply heaping up a lot of trouble for himself and the candidates at the next election. There will be general dissatisfaction because conditions are being changed entirely. Suppose we have an enumerator for each polling district. The enumerators for the municipalities would vary in number because some municipalities have only one polling district, and others have two or three. I repeat that the secretary-treasurer is the best man for this work. He is a permanent official, and generally a man of education and standing in the community. He would simply have to make the necessary changes under this Bill in the existing list, and everybody in the municipality would be satisfied.

If you take the other course suggested, which may be a good and proper course in the West, but with which we are not familiar in the province of Quebec, you reverse the whole position of affairs.

Mr. HAZEN: I did not hear the first part of the remarks made by my hon. friend from Carleton, but from what I heard I judged that he was claiming that the revision in New Brunswick at the present time was not satisfactory, and that as a result the lists were not satisfactory.

Mr. CARVELL: I was complaining of the provision in this Bill for enumerating the women voters in New Brunswick, and I was giving as an illustration the conditions which have existed there in the past and pointing out that they are very unsatisfactory and should be changed.

Mr. HAZEN: I think I correctly caught the tenor of what my hon. friend said. The counties of New Brunswick are divided into parishes, which, with the exception of two, each elect two representatives to the county council. There are two parishes in the county of St. John, where the representation is three instead of two, but practically the representation of every parish on the county councils is two. The lists are revised every year, and the revisers are the two county councillors who are elected every second year, I think, the third member of the board being a reviser who is appointed by the Lieutenant Governor in Council. As a result you have for your revisers in the parish at least two men who must be very familiar with the parish, because as county councillors it is their duty to know the people, and having to run elections every second year, they naturally have a thorough knowledge of their people. In my experience there has been little fault found with the lists as we

have them in New Brunswick. The list in force to-day is the list that came into force on, I think, January 2 of the present year.

Mr. CARVELL: On January 1.

Mr. HAZEN: The next list will come into force on the first or second day of January, 1918. The list which is now in force and which will be used as the basis if an election is held now under this Act, is the list which came into force on January 2, 1917, and the same list on which the provincial elections were held in February last. I have been through every election in New Brunswick for a great many years past, and since the present Act came into force I have heard very little fault found with it. True it is there is no appeal when the list is once made and published. The list is, in a sense, a permanent list, and the duty of the revisors is to strike off names of those who during the year have left, or died, or otherwise become ineligible to be on the list, and to add to the list those who have become eligible, or acquired the necessary qualifications. They post up in public places throughout the parishes and the cities the names of those whom they propose to strike off, and the names of those whom they propose to add. An opportunity is thus afforded to political parties or to individuals to bring to the attention of the revisors before the list is finally made up and filed, the names of those whom they think should be added, the names of those whom they think should be struck off, or the names of those who are improperly struck off and should be retained. In the cities, which are divided into wards, the system is practically the same, with the exception that the city council appoint two of its number to act as revisors, the third being appointed by the provincial government. After the lists are made up and filed, there is no appeal, and they become effective in January, and are the lists used for any election that may take place during the year. To some people this may appear at first blush to be a very serious defect. I was a member of the legislature when this Act was revised, and when the present Act was passed, and my hon. friends will probably recall the fact that the doing away with appeal was by the common consent of both parties in the legislature at the time. It was found there was a great deal of trouble and difficulty in taking appeals to the sheriff, who was an official appointed by the Government of the day, and therefore scarcely a man who would exercise the very best judgment. A great deal of trouble, expense, and difficulty arose in connection with those appeals, and both parties in the legislature agreed on the revision such as is now in effect. It was felt that while there might be occasional individual cases in which possibly injustice or hardship would be done, it would be far better to dispense with those appeals altogether. If I recollect rightly, my hon. friend from Northumberland (Mr. Loggie) was a member of the legislature at the time. It was under that system that the Dominion elections of 1908 and of 1911, as well as all the local elections which have intervened in the meantime, were held. So far as I am aware, there never has been any agitation for a change of the system. I note my hon. friend says it is the intention of the present government of New Brunswick to introduce a new Act some time in the future. That cannot be done, of course, until there is another session of the legislature, and in the ordinary course of events there will not be another session of the New Brunswick legislature before the month of February or March next. Inasmuch as it is fully expected that the federal elections will be over before the New Brunswick legislature meets, it would be impossible for us to frame a Bill anticipating any changes which might be made by the legislature of that province.

There has been very little trouble with our lists, and I think every man who has been interested in politics in New Brunswick will agree with me in that statement. Some years ago, there were quite extensive frauds attempted which were spoken of as the "Swamp Vote." Names of people who did not live in the county, and had no property in the county, were put on the lists. As a result of that, and as a result of the frauds attempted in connection with what is known as the Rothesay list, the legislature enacted that no one should have the right to vote for the provincial or federal House who is not at the time of tendering his vote a resident of, and domiciled in, the division in which he votes. There prevails the policy of one man, one vote. The voter has to poll his vote in the place where he lives and is domiciled. There is no such thing as a non-resident vote, and the ownership of real estate in a district does not give the right to vote to a man who does not live there. The present list, which came into force in January, and on which the recent local election were held, will be the list used in the next Dominion elections with these changes: from it will be struck all the names of those

aliens who are disqualified, and to it will be added the names of the women who have the right to vote under the provisions of the present Bill. It seems to me there will be very little difficulty in making up a list which will be thoroughly satisfactory to both political parties under that system.

My hon. friend referred to another subject in regard to the votes that are given to the female relatives of members of the Naval Service and to some correspondence from Mr. Calder, a member of a well known family in Charlotte county, New Brunswick who, it seems, wanted to sell or charter a patrol boat to the Naval Department and whose offer was not accepted. I know nothing about the case myself; I have never heard of it. If my hon. friend will go over the list of boats that have been purchased or chartered by the department since the war broke out, I venture to say that it will be found that as many of these boats have been purchased or chartered from gentlemen who are members of the political party to which my hon. friend belongs, as from members of the political party to which I belong.

Mr. CARVELL: My hon. friend is smiling when he makes that statement.

Mr. HAZEN: I make that statement in all good faith though I smile because my hon. friend would never believe it possible that a Liberal should receive anything approaching fair play at the hands of this Administration. All these boats that we have chartered or purchased for the Naval Service were secured after careful examination by the permanent and responsible officials of the department and our only desire and anxiety have been to get boats suitable for the purpose for which they were secured. My hon. friend puts it before the House as if every man from whom we purchased or chartered a motor boat would become a member of the Naval Service and that his female relatives would be entitled to vote. Such will not be the case. His female relatives will not get any votes under the provisions of this Bill. They only get votes who are relatives of the men who are enlisted in the naval forces of Canada. As I said earlier this afternoon, there are about 2,800 such men of whom 1,500 are serving overseas. The others are serving in vessels such as the Rainbow, submarines, and other vessels working in connection with the Naval Service and in addition the men who are serving in the patrol vessels which are doing work of a distinctively naval character and recognized as such all over the world, particularly in Great Britain. This work consists in patrolling the coast to see that no base is established by the submarines of the enemy and such other work as the department finds necessary after consultation with the authorities of the Admiralty and after getting the best advice it can in regard to the matter.

Mr. MARCIL: Does the patrol service extend inland on the St. Lawrence any distance, or is it confined to the Atlantic seaboard?

Mr. HAZEN: A certain number of patrol vessels patrol the coasts of Canada. I regard the coast of Newfoundland, the straits of Belle Isle and the waters of the gulf of St. Lawrence as the coast of Canada in that connection. The men on these vessels are doing work of a dangerous character. We have had losses of life, not from the enemy, but from the perils of the sea, because these men have to go out in severe storms at any time they are called upon. They enlisted for naval service, they are naval men, they are doing naval work and are doing work of a hazardous character. The female relatives of these men will get votes.

Mr. McKENZIE: Would it not be well, as they are comparatively few in number, to put in the Bill the names of the ships service on which qualifies the female relatives of these men to vote?

Mr. HAZEN: These vessels change and are added to from time to time, and I do not think the suggestion of the hon. member for North Cape Breton (Mr. McKenzie) would be very practicable or easy to work out. I told the committee before—perhaps I had better do so again—that the female relatives of cadets of the Naval College, who were referred to in the House yesterday, are not entitled to vote under this Bill. A certain number of boys in the Naval Service are employed on ships. Every one knows that in His Majesty's Navy, in addition to men of mature years, boys are employed on the vessels; they are enrolled, and are as distinctly members of the Naval Service as are the men of more mature years. In the Canadian navy most of these boys are from 16 to 18 years of age. Under the regulation they should be from 14 to 18, but in actual practice very few are found under 16 years of age, as they do not go into the service at as early an age as they do in Great Britain. It is proposed that the female relatives of those who are doing active service in con-

nection with the defence of the country should have votes, but it is not proposed that female relatives of the owner of a patrol or motor boat, or a boat of any sort that has been chartered by the department, shall have votes, because he does not come under the definition in the Naval Service Act of a member of the naval forces of the country.

Mr. CARVELL: I am not so innocent as to think that this Bill permits the female relatives of every man who happens to lease a boat to the Government to get a vote, but in nearly every case the man who leases the boat goes with the boat.

Mr. HAZEN: No.

Mr. CARVELL: This is what happened in the Calder case—

Mr. HAZEN: I know the Calder family of Charlotte very well. Will my hon. friend state for what purpose this boat was chartered?

Mr. CARVELL: It was not chartered.

Mr. HAZEN: Or purchased?

Mr. CARVELL: It was not purchased; the man was a Grit and they would not have anything to do with him.

Mr. HAZEN: For what purpose was it that the Naval Department was seeking to acquire a boat of the character of Mr. Calder's and why was it that the department did not take it over from him?

Mr. CARVELL: Here is the letter of the department to Mr. Calder:

> I am directed by the Deputy Minister of the Naval Service to inform you that he is unable to accept your valued tender of April 12, 1916, for motor boat for patrol service.

The man who was lucky enough to have his boat accepted as a motor boat for patrol service in the Canadian navy enlists in the Naval Service and in nine cases out of ten he simply draws pay and does nothing. I want to test my hon. friend's sincerity in this. It was all very nice for the hon. gentleman to try and make the country believe that the Government are not putting through this Act because they see in it a chance to steal the election. It is coming on winter time, there are no German boats around the coast and no mines except the mines that we may have laid ourselves and no mine-sweeping except going out for practice. Is my hon. friend willing to restrict this Canadian naval vote to the people who have enlisted up to the present time, or is he going to rent all the boats on the coast of Canada which are owned by Tories and swear the owners in as members of the naval force and give their wives votes?

Mr. HAZEN: There is no idea in the mind of any official in the Naval Department that we are going to charter a whole lot of boats for the sake of giving votes to the female relatives of the men who own them. They would not get votes anyway unless the men enlisted in the Naval Service and prepared to serve in the defence of the country until after the war.

Mr. CARVELL: Does he not think that any one who owns a boat on the Atlantic coast would be willing to enlist under conditions now existing? He gets a great big per diem allowance on his boat and does not have to do anything. That is what they are all after. That is what this man Calder who, I presume, is a Liberal, is finding fault with, that they would not give him a chance because he is a Grit. This talk about the Canadian Naval Service is the greatest nonsense these people have uttered since the war began. The minister has hundreds of these little boats in his employ, for which he pays large sums, but which contribute nothing to the defence of Canada or towards the war, and never will. If he is sincere, why not say that the female relatives of no person who enlists in the Canadian navy after this date will have the right to vote.

Mr. HAZEN: The statement that we have hundreds of these boats is about as exaggerated as many others made by the hon. member. We have engaged only such boats as were absolutely necessary for defence purposes.

Mr. CARVELL: Tell the committee how many.

Mr. HAZEN: The hon. member asks that the female relations of men who have been enrolled and enlisted in the navy up to the present time only shall have votes. I do not know what view the Secretary of State or the other members of the Government would take of that suggestion, but I do say it would be doing great injustice, as we are still enlisting men and sending them everywhere—

Mr. CARVELL: Yes, hiring boats.

Mr. HAZEN: —we are still enlisting men and sending them overseas. When they go overseas they go on vessels of the British navy which are engaged in work of the most important and dangerous description.

Mr. CARVELL: I was not finding fault with the men who go overseas but with the men who stay in Canada.

Mr. HAZEN: A provision restricting this right to the relatives of men who have already enlisted would have no appreciable effect; it would not vary conditions to the extent of ten votes. Between now and next spring few if any boats will be chartered or purchased by the Government of Canada, and I do not think that my hon. friend's suggestion would make a particle of difference to the vote which will take place in a few months.

Mr. CARVELL: Then show your good faith by making the change.

Mr. HAZEN: I would have no objection to doing so, only there might be cases where grave injustice would be caused.

Mr. MARCIL: Does not the patrol service extend up the St. Lawrence and the Great Lakes?

Mr. HAZEN: The hon. gentleman will understand how undesirable it would be to discuss the patrol service in the House; but we shall be glad to give him, as a member of Parliament, all information at any time.

Mr. KYTE: I reminded the Minister of Marine sometime ago that in the ports of Sydney and Glace bay a considerable number of motor boats have been employed by the Government and the owners have been in charge of them ever since they were taken over. I have in mind one boat not chartered by the Department of Naval Affairs but by another department. The owner of that boat has been receiving $15 per day for the past two years for the services of that boat, out of which he has to pay the wages of one man and the oil used. He has drawn some $11,000 for the hire of his motor boat, which originally could not have cost more than $600 or $700. I endeavoured to get a list of the motor boats employed by the Government at Sydney, but, for reasons which satisfied me, that list was not given out and I must depend for any information I give to the committee upon inquiries I have made at Sydney and Glace bay.

5 p.m.

Sir ROBERT BORDEN: What is the name of the boat referred to and what department is she employed?

Mr. KYTE: I think it is the Helena. She is employed by the Customs Department.

With regard to men who have enlisted for service, I know that in Halifax there are some forty men, masters and mates, who were engaged by the Department of Naval Affairs as far back as June to take charge of patrol boats. These boats have not yet been supplied, and still these men are drawing pay and living at the Acadian hotel which has been taken over by the department as a boarding house for them. They have done nothing except to go out for an hour or two each day in Halifax harbour for instruction in mine-sweeping. Will their female relatives be entitled to vote?

Mr. HAZEN: Those men are enrolled and enlisted and belong to the naval forces of Canada. They are going on boats that will be ready in a very short time, the construction of which has been delayed. As soon as the boats are ready these men will be engaged in a very important and arduous work. Their time is not being wasted at Halifax as they are receiving instruction which will be of great value when they take up their work. It was found that we could not safely put off their employment to a later date. They must be ready for duty the moment the boats are ready. Their female relatives would undoubtedly have the right to vote.

Mr. KYTE: I understand that there is quite a large waiting list of masters and mates who have applied for similar positions, so that I do not think there would have been much danger to the department if they had delayed making these appointments. Will the instructors on the Niobe at Halifax, who are giving instruction to the cadets and students at the naval college, be included in the naval forces, so that their female relatives will have the right to vote?

Mr. HAZEN: If they are enrolled and enlisted as members of the naval service and are bound to serve during the period of the war, they will belong to the naval forces of Canada. I cannot tell my hon. friend, offhand, however, whether they are in that position or not. With regard to the masters and mates, their training has taken a somewhat longer time than we had anticipated, but that is something that could not possibly have been prevented. In Great Britain the highest value is attached to the services rendered by men of the mercantile marine, by fishermen, and others, who are engaged in mine-sweeping and other work of an important and dangerous character.

Mr. BUREAU: The minister said that it would not be advisable to make public the information asked for by the member for Bonaventure. Could the information be given privately?

Mr. HAZEN: If the hon. gentleman applies to the department the information will be given to him privately.

Mr. L. A. LAPOINTE: Answers have been made to question put by hon. gentlemen in respect to matters affecting provinces other than Quebec. That province is referred to in only one place, page 16 of the reprinted Bill. I quote from section 65A as amended:

1. In the provinces of Quebec, Nova Scotia and New Brunswick the enumerators shall adopt as the basis of the lists of voters which they respectively shall compile the lists prepared for the several polling divisions established, and which on the sixtieth day next preceding the day fixed for the nomination of candidates for the election were in force, or were last in force, under the laws of the province, for the purposes of provincial elections, and they shall not add to such basis list any other names than those of female voters qualified to vote by this part of this Act nor strike off nor erase therefrom any other names than those of persons disqualified from voting, by this part of this Act, and section 62 of this Act shall apply only to qualified female voters whose names do not appear on any list compiled by any enumerator and to persons whose names he has erased or struck from such basis list.

The Secretary of State has done some nice drafting in this Bill in providing for mushroom enumerators. Section 42 of the Dominion Elections Act, as amended by this Bill, is where the mushroom enumerator comes in. It reads:

Subject to the provisions of section 65a of this Act the Governor in Council may appoint enumerators in each province to make lists of the electors in each electoral district, and the returning officer of each electoral district shall assign one of such enumerators to each polling district therein.

Under one provision of the Bill it is provided that the enumerator shall adopt the old list as the basis for the making up of the new one, but this last provision seems to require him to make out new lists. Although it is provided that in the province of Quebec he shall take the old lists as a basis, it is further provided that he shall compile an entirely new list. I should like to have an explanation of that. I wrote to Hon. E. L. Patenaude, then Secretary of State, on June 6, asking him to send me a list of the electors of St. James Division, Montreal. On June 7 he wrote me a letter —I think it was his last communication as minister; he resigned on that day—enclosing the list I asked for. I find that St. James Division, Montreal, has 88 polling booths and 7,343 voters. That list includes outsiders, people who were born in Ontario. It includes Jews who may be regarded by the enumerator as persons of German birth, and who may be, therefore, struck off the list. How is the enumerator to find out what female electors should go on the list? How is he to find out how many soldiers have gone to the front from St. James Division? How is he to obtain information as to the wives, sisters and female relatives of these soldiers? I suppose he will take as a basis the list already existing, compile a new list, and send it to the returning officer. Who will revise this list that the enumerator has compiled? The basis of the list of electors in Quebec is by virtue of article 180 of the Election Act of Quebec, amended in 1912 and in 1915, so as to have the system of "one man one vote." Article 180 says:

The following persons, and no others, being males, and who at the time of the deposit of the list under articles 196 and 197, or 222 or 223, as the case may be, are domiciled within the limits of the municipality for which the list is made, and who are of the full age of 21 years, subjects of His Majesty by birth or naturalization and not otherwise legally disqualified, shall be entered upon the list of electors.

The suffrage in Quebec is very wide. The franchise is given to sons of owners, occupiers or tenants, every man over 21 years of age who has an average revenue of $10 per month. I am not going to say anything about the rural districts. In the municipalities the list is made up by the secretary-treasurer of every village and deposited on the 15th of this month. The list is posted up, and if there is any objection, or if any one claims that his name should be put on, the municipal council deals with the matter. In the city of Montreal we are under article 224. We make up the list every two years. Notice is given that those who have the necessary franchise shall appear and swear that they are entitled to vote. The list is made up in December. In January, notice is given that the Board of Revisors will go over the list and receive complaints as to errors. This board is created by virtue of article 224 of the Election Act, which says:

There shall be, for each of the cities of Montreal, Quebec and Three Rivers, a board of revision called the "Board of Revisors of the city of (name of the city)." The said board shall be composed of three persons selected and appointed as follows: The city council of each of the said cities shall appoint one of the said revisors. . . . The Lieutenant Governor in Council shall appoint the other two revisors.

In Montreal these three gentlemen compose this board: the Hon. Justice F. X. Choquette, who is the president; Mr. George A. Morrison, K.C., and Mr. Harvey, K.C. In

January, they went over the list and found it correct, and the city council of Montreal is bound by the law to send a copy of that list to Ottawa. This is the copy I have in my hand. The point I want to make is this: Is it necessary, when we have the guarantee of the reputation of Mr. Justice Choquette and of those other two gentlemen, that they will make up a proper list, that we should hand over the work to one enumerator who may be appointed to the dissatisfaction of the whole community? You are proposing to take the old list as a basis. Why could not Mr. Justice Choquette and the other two gentlemen add on the names of the women voters and strike out the names of foreigners whose names they think should be stricken out? Why put in this mushroom enumerator? The enumerator might be a kind of a dog mushroom, because there are different kinds of mushrooms. We shall have to watch the enumerator. I shall have to sit next to him in order to see that he does not strike out or add on names which should not be stricken out or added. By leaving the list to the Board of Revisors in Quebec and Montreal, there is every guarantee that it will be made up properly and to the satisfaction of all concerned. In that way also, the Government would save a great deal of money. In Quebec we have 65 counties, and there would have to be at least 65 enumerators with the right of the returning officer of the county to name more; that is to say, one to every polling subdivision. I fail to understand why the Government is introducing this system of enumerators. We never had such a thing before in Quebec. Under subsection 62, a person may go to an enumerator and say: I have the right to vote. The enumerator may refuse, but he will generally give the right to vote to anybody so that it may be that in every booth there will be five or six or seven of those people coming to vote. What control have you in that case? The deputy returning officer or the representative of a candidate can challenge, but at the same time, if this person offers to swear, he must receive the vote. There will, therefore, be an electoral campaign in every polling booth. There will be discussion there as to whether such a person shall be allowed to vote or not. You will have one agent fighting against the other agent, and you will find that there is really no basis for the list. The list will apparently be made up, but at the same time it will be so disrupted by the enumerators that nobody will recognize it. There will be a fight in the booth. To save all this I would ask that the Board of Revisors be permitted to revise the list in the city of Montreal, to receive all complaints, to strike out the names of foreigners whose names should be struck off and to add the names of the women whose names should, according to this measure, be added. You may take all the precautions you like to name a good enumerator, but he will be a partisan. Two years ago every one expected an election. The people of Montreal thought there would be an election.

Partisanship came in. I was asked to look after the revision of the electoral list of St. James, but I had no money to spend for that purpose. My opponent, however, had an office controlled by a great politician whom we sometimes see in this House. He appointed two men for each polling subdivision, and these two men made every one who applied to be put on the voters' list establish his qualifications. A man called Peter, we will say, would come along, and these two men would say, "We don't know Peter," and Peter would be struck off the list. About fifteen hundred names were struck off in that way. Last year 700 or 800 applied to be put on the voters' list in St James, and no organization was formed to strike off names. I thought the Government had possibly decided to prepare a new list. Full opportunity was given to applicants to be put on the list. Does any one expect that we will get justice if these enumerators are appointed? There is not the slightest doubt that the enumerators who will be appointed will be the best string-pullers in the municipality. They will be near to the Government in some way or other, and we shall have to look after our own interests. I think it would be far better to leave it to the judge.

Mr. MEIGHEN: It is true that the enumerator makes a complete list and hands that list to the returning officer, but in making that list he is compelled by law to put on every man who is on the list that exists for that poll, except aliens naturalized since March 31, 1902, and conscientious objectors. He is also compelled to add the women who are enfranchised under this Bill, and those only. Those are his duties as defined by law. That work of his is subject to appeal to the judges. If Judge Choquette is the judge who would sit on a recount, he will sit and have just the same authority as before, and I hope he will exercise it well, as no doubt he will. Nothing else is subject to appeal. Why? Because it has all been judicially revised before.

We do not propose to appoint string-pullers or mushrooms as enumerators.

Mr. L. A. LAPOINTE: These things might occur after the election.

Mr. MEIGHEN: The election will not be decided until the judge is through with his work. As long as the result of the election depends upon his work, it makes no difference whether his work is done before or after polling day. It is the result that counts, and that result depends just as much upon the judicial work of the judge as if he did it before polling day. That is the intent of the Act, and I am sure if my hon. friend will consult with his friends around him he will be advised that that is exactly what is embodied in the Bill.

My hon. friend from Carleton made a suggestion to us with regard to the boys who might from the date of the passing of this Act be enlisted for patrol work on the Canadian coast, and he asked that any so enlisted should not be counted among those whose female relatives would be permitted to vote. As soon as he made the proposal it struck me as reasonable, and he put it as a test of our sincerity. I accept my hon. friend's suggestion, and am prepared to embody it in the Bill. I do so for the reason that it is in line with the spirit of the Bill as it now stands. We declined to give the vote to the women relatives of the soldiers in Canada, and to my mind the chief reason was that it would admit of abuse. There would undoubtedly be the possibility of taking enlistments, and if there is any possibility of that in connection with the naval forces around the shores of Canada I do not think it is unreasonable that the suggestion of my hon. friend should be accepted, and that 33A should be amended accordingly. Between six and eight o'clock I will prepare an amendment embodying the suggestion of my hon. friend.

Mr. CARVELL: I am very thankful indeed to the Solicitor General for this small fraction of comfort, which I am sure will be of some value around the eastern coast of Canada. I should like my hon. friend to consider between now and eight o'clock the other side of the case. When this Bill was introduced I listened to him very carefully, and the reason which he gave for the enfranchising of the women relatives of the soldier overseas was that that soldier could not be here to exercise his influence among his neighbours, and therefore his influence could not be exerted to its fullest extent in the election. He stated that the man who had enlisted but had not left Canada was not in the same position, because he was here to exercise his influence, and his female relatives were therefore not entitled to the vote.

Mr. MEIGHEN: That is another reason.

Mr. CARVELL: That is the principal reason. Now the men in the patrol service around Canada are here and can exercise their influence to a much greater degree than the soldier who is in Canada, because the soldier is confined to barracks and is not liable to get around among his neighbours, whereas the man in the patrol service is living at home, carrying on his ordinary business, and just as much able to exercise his influence during an election as ever he was in his lifetime. I do not think my hon. friend understands the conditions in the patrol service. These men are simply living at home and carrying on their ordinary occupations, and the Government is paying them for the boats. If there be any reason for excluding the women relatives of the soldier who is in Canada, there is a double reason for excluding the woman relatives of members of the patrol service. However I am very thankful for the small concession my hon. friend has made, and I hope he will take this further suggestion into consideration between now and eight o'clock.

Mr. NEELY: In connection with this cloven-footed provision which disfranchises all British subjects who have been naturalized since March 31, 1902, I would like to ask the Secretary of State what evidence or proof, or what safeguard is there in this Bill as to the nature of the evidence that will be considered sufficient by the enumerator, or by the deputy returning officer, when a voter is voting and is challenged as to whether he was born in an alien enemy country.

Mr. MEIGHEN: The judge decides that.

Mr. NEELY: But here is a man who is making application to the enumerator to go on the list, and he speaks the German language—

Mr. MEIGHEN: He is refused.

Mr. NEELY: But he was born in the United States. The enumerator says: "Well, I don't know whether you were born in the United States or not." Is he refused by the enumerator?

Mr. MEIGHEN: If he is born in the United States he should not be refused by the enumerator, and if he is refused he can vote and his vote will be counted.

Mr. NEELY: It will be tied up.

Mr. MEIGHEN: But the enumerator would not gain anything by that.

Mr. NEELY: How is the enumerator to decide whether this man should be put on the list? Is he to take the man's word when he says that he was born in the United States, or that he was born in Germany? What proof must a man furnish? Surely, the Secretary of State does not expect a man to produce his birth certificate? It does not seem to me there is any safeguard here whatever.

Mr. MEIGHEN: I think it would be unreasonable to demand a birth certificate if the man did not have it. If he had his birth certificate, of course he might be asked to produce it. I do not think there will be very much doubt as to the origin of the men who are under the jurisdiction of the enumerator, because he has only one poll and he knows the people. He has for years known what the public has generally considered was the place of birth of John Schmitz. He has understood it all along, and in the majority of cases it is clear there would be no dispute about it. If there was a dispute he could make inquiries from the neighbours, and so on, and if by any chance he was wrong, then it comes before the judge, who takes such evidence as he would take in any civil proceedings.

Sir WILFRID LAURIER: When does it come before the judge?

Mr. MEIGHEN: On the recount.

Sir WILRFID LAURIER: It is tied up until then.

Mr. MEIGHEN: But what is the difference? When this safeguard was put in, it was done in the belief that it secured absolute judicial revision, and for the life of me I cannot see why a judicial revision, which takes place before the result of the poll is determined, is not as effective as if there was no necessity at all for such revision.

Mr. NEELY: The safeguard spoken of by the Secretary of State does not seem to me to meet the point at all. The actual working-out of this feature will be this: if you get an active partisan as enumerator, and send him into a German-speaking polling division—a number of which I have in my own constituency—he can doubt any man's word, he can refuse to put the name of any German-speaking man on the list, and when that man comes to vote, his name not being on the enumerator's list, if he votes at all he must swear in his vote. These votes will be put in envelopes, and will be considered before the judge on a recount. I can imagine in a constituency where there would be perhaps forty or fifty polling divisions, largely constituted of men of German birth or extraction, if the candidate wished to protect his interests and to protect the interests of every voter in those forty or fifty polling divisions, he might have to bring all these men before a judge on a recount to verify their right to vote.

Mr. MEIGHEN: They have to swear to their exact qualification in order to vote.

Mr. NEELY: Exactly. It seems to me the scrutineer of that polling division might challenge every one of these votes, and compel the deputy returning officer to put them into envelopes to be brought before the judge in a recount.

Mr. MEIGHEN: If the enumerator refuses to put a man's name on, and the man is prepared to swear he has the right to vote, nobody can challenge that. It goes in the envelope anyway.

Mr. NEELY: So much the worse. If the man has to swear in order to vote, then automatically his vote goes into the envelope.

Mr. MEIGHEN: If the enumerator makes him swear.

Mr. NEELY: Giving the enumerator credit for being conscientious and trying to do the right thing, although a partisan, should we put upon him the responsibility of deciding as to whether or not a man who was born in the United States or in an alien enemy country, should or should not have the right to vote? I think that is an entirely unfair proposition.

Mr. MEIGHEN: It is subject to judicial review.

Mr. NEELY: Supposing the man does swear in his vote, and he has to appear before the judge on recount. What evidence is the judge to accept?

Mr. MEIGHEN: That position arises in every case. The judge will be governed by the laws of evidence. I do not know how you are going to determine anything ultimately except by the laws of evidence of this country. The rule of evidence is that the judge will demand the best evidence that can be secured. This would be the certificate of birth, but if this certifi-

cate is not securable, then he gets the next best evidence that can be secured. That is plainly put in the rule of evidence, and that is the rule the judge will follow.

Mr. NEELY: I think it would be very much fairer to candidates and to voters if this Act were to state the class of evidence which would necessarily be accepted by the enumerator as to the place of a man's birth, so that if he were born in the United States, or in some friendly country, his name could be put on the list and he would not necessarily be sworn, and his vote tied up, nor would he be under the necessity of appearing before a judge on a recount.

Mr. MEIGHEN: If that were done there would be the same difficulty. If the enumerator is honest, he will take the best evidence he can get. If he is dishonest he will not. Supposing he is dishonest, and is told by the law to take such and such evidence, but does not do it, all the man can do is vote, and have his ballot tied. It would be tied anyway. As long as the man has his recourse to go before a judge of the land, no injustice can be done to him.

Mr. NEELY: The point I make is, that the enumerator has nothing in this Act to guide him as to what kind of proof or evidence is proof or evidence to him that the man is not entitled to be on the list?

Mr. MEIGHEN: Nor has the judge anything to guide him under the ordinary law of the land. The judge has to take the best evidence available, and the enumerator has to do the same thing, and if you put up hard and fast rules I think hon. gentlemen will find the matter would be a good deal worse than it is now.

Mr. NEELEY: I see in the present arrangement the possibility of the entire vote of a polling division being tied up.

Mr. MEIGHEN: I do not think that is possible for the reason that, if the enumerator were to act like that, he would be in a most unenviable position when he was landed before a judge, on a subpoena from the other side, afterwards. He had sworn to do his part. I would not like to be the enumerator and, similarly, I would not like to be the challenger at the polls. There is that check. But, suppose he did, no injustice would be done to the hon. member for Humboldt. If either party wants to make a fool of itself it can but it does not do it any good. It finally comes before the judge who, we presume, will be absolutely fair.

Mr. NEELY: The enumerator is not a lawyer or a judge and he wants to know. I am assuming that he wants to be fair but there is the case of the man who does not want to be fair and who may say: If he tells me that he is from the United States I am supposed to take his word. I would suggest that it would be a great injustice to ask a man in the short time of an election campaign to back up his claim to citizenship. The other man who is affected by this Act is a naturalized British subject and he has taken the oath of allegiance. He has a naturalization certificate. In taking his oath he gives his place of birth under circumstances that do not in any way tend to fraud. When he was taking out naturalization there was no reason why he should say that he was born in the United States when he was actually born in Germany. The naturalization certificate should be prima facie evidence as far as putting the man on the list is concerned.

Mr. MEIGHEN: I too think it would be prima facie evidence but it would not be conclusive.

Mr. KNOWLES: That would make it conclusive.

Mr. MEIGHEN: Suppose a man could not find his affidavit and suppose also that his certificate was missing—we have provided that a judge can weigh the evidence of the man's right to vote without giving the absolute right to everybody who cannot locate his affidavit. He might have difficulty in getting his affidavit although he had his certificate.

Mr. BUREAU: I want to call the minister's attention to clause 33(a). I take it that the female relatives, enumerated, of the man who has served overseas, whether he is back in this country or not, have the right to vote?

Mr. MEIGHEN: Yes.

Mr. BUREAU: In that case I would ask the Secretary of State to strike out the word "person" as it appears in line thirty of this clause:

> Every female person shall be capable of voting and qualified to vote at a Dominion election in any province or in the Yukon Territory, who, being a British subject, and qualified as to age, race and residence as required in the case of a male person in such province or in the Yukon Territory, as the case may be, is the wife, widow, mother, sister or daughter of any person.

I would propose to insert "military elector" in place of "person."

Mr. MEIGHEN: And leave in "living or dead"?

Mr. BUREAU: Leave in the rest but substitute for "person" "military elector."

Mr. MEIGHEN: Then we would have to define "military elector."

Mr. BUREAU: That is defined in the Military Voters Act. I suggest that out of respect for the soldier himself. I was reading in the papers the other day about a man who was being chased around this country, an outlaw, who is a returned soldier, a dynamiter named Monette or Girard. It is not right that the mother, wife, daughter or sister of a man who has been at the front and has served his country well should go to the poll with the wife or sister of this man Monette, an outlaw and a deserter, for whom the police have been looking. The term "military elector," although not contained in this Act, is defined in the Military Voters Act, and I think that, for the honour and dignity of those men who are at the front and doing their duty, it is proper that it should be used in this Act rather than the word "person." The definition of "military elector" in the Military Voters Act is:

"Military elector" means and includes every person, male or female, who, being a British subject, whether or not ordinarily resident in Canada and whether or not a minor or an Indian, has been, while within or without Canada, appointed, enlisted, enrolled or called out for active service as one of the Canadian Expeditionary Force, the Royal Canadian Navy, the Canadian Militia on active service, or the Royal Naval Canadian Volunteer Reserve, or has been, while within Canada, appointed, enlisted or enrolled as one of the British Royal Flying Corps, Royal Naval Aviation Service, or Auxiliary Motor Boat Patrol.

I have been looking over that clause, and I find that it covers every man whom the Minister of Naval Service would like to have included. It may extend the franchise a little farther than the Secretary of State intends. We might restrict it, if the minister desires to do so, with reference to the men who have not yet left Canada. On the other hand, I would like the persons whose relatives are entitled to vote under clause 33 (a) to be designated as a "military elector" who is serving or who has been honourably discharged, instead of by the word "person."

Mr. MEIGHEN: The suggestion is a very valuable one. It did not occur to me that the relatives of a deserter would be included here, but I rather think they would be. It would be quite wrong that the relatives of those who had joined and deserted should be on a par with the relatives of the man who was serving or who had been honourably discharged.

Mr. CARVELL: Section 63 of the Act as it now stands provides that any person, practically, who is on the voters' list can be challenged and if he refuses to take the oath in form Z he cannot vote. Then section 65 provides that every voter shall be entitled to vote whose name is on the voters' list and has not been erased therefrom in accordance with the foregoing provisions of this Bill. I assume that the enumerator takes the list as it comes from the Clerk of the Crown in Chancery or the custodian of the list in New Brunswick, erases from it the names of any former alien enemies, and adds the names of the female voters, and that becomes the list for the election. Therefore it seems that every voter is entitled to vote whose name is on the list unless he refuses to take the oath in form Z. But form Z merely refers to people in Saskatchewan, Alberta and the Yukon Territory and not in the rest of Canada. At section 153 it will be found that in the rest of Canada we have a distinct cause of challenge on the ground that a man does not comply with the qualification provided by the provincial statute. In New Brunswick, he must take an oath that he is a resident of the constituency in which he attempts to vote; but if you leave the Bill as it is now, you render nugatory that provision of our law which prevents him from voting in a constituency in which he does not reside. In other words, it comes back to what I said earlier in the afternoon; in my constituency, I have no doubt there are from 100 to 200 names on the voters' lists who do not live in the constituency and have not for years, but who, for political reasons, have been deliberately kept on those lists in order that they may be brought from the United States to vote.

Mr. HAZEN: How can they vote? They have to take the oath, and that would be perjury.

Mr. CARVELL: They do. But there has been a change in the East and the man who attempts to perjure himself now will be in the worst scrape he ever was in. It will be no longer safe for a man to come from Boston or the state of Maine and perjure himself because his name is on the voters' list. But if the law stands as it is now I am afraid that man will be safe and we cannot put the oath to him because,

once his name is on the list, he can come from Boston or anywhere and we cannot prevent him because, being on the list made out by an enumerator, he has a right to vote. That means a serious thing to me, perhaps 100 or 150 votes. I would ask the minister to look into this carefully before eight o'clock.

At six o'clock the House took recess.

After Recess.

The committee resumed at eight o'clock.

Mr. CARVELL: Before the Secretary of State replies to the question that I put to him before six o'clock, I should like to call his attention to the provisions of section 63 of the Act as it now stands. The section reads:

> Every person whose name is on the voters' list, unless sworn as in the next preceding section provided, shall before being permitted to vote, if required by any candidate, agent or elector, take the oath number one in Form Z.

If he refuses to take the oath, his name shall be erased from the voters' list. But the swearing " in the next preceding section provided " is that in the case of persons who have been added to the list by the certificate of the enumerator on election day. Section 62 provides challenge only for a limited number of people; section 63 is the general challenge provision, but my hon. friend will find that form Z could not be used at all except in Saskatchewan, Alberta, and the Yukon territory.

Mr. MEIGHEN: Form Z is omitted. Section 62, page 8 of the Bill, says:

> (q) by striking out Form Z No. 1 and inserting instead the following:
> "Form Z No. 1. You swear that you are legally qualified to vote at this election, that you are of the ('male' or 'female') sex, a British subject, and of the full age of 21 years."

I had this matter looked into during the recess, and those who looked into it are thoroughly satisfied—from their report to me I think that they are right—that that fully meets the point raised by the hon. gentleman before six o'clock. The amendment to form Z makes form Z the proper oath to be taken by all persons other than those who are sworn because the enumerator will not let them go on the list.

Mr. CARVELL: Legally the minister is right, but that is not sufficient for my purpose. Section 153 of the Dominion Elections Act, which was added in 1909, before the last general election, at the request of members from New Brunswick, was designed to meet the very condition I have pointed out to the minister. We have had a terrible condition of affairs in New Brunswick because of the fact that the names of men who live in the United States have been kept on the lists. They are brought into the province for a consideration amounting anywhere from $5 to $25, and in some cases $50. My hon. friend (Mr. Graham) says, "pretty high." I can tell him that they have paid as high as $100—as a matter of fact, $100 was a kind of upset price against me in 1911. These men were brought over and swore that they were qualified. In order to meet that condition section 153 was inserted, providing that, in addition to complying with the general law, a man must take any oath provided for by provincial legislation. There is an oath in the law of New Brunswick in which a man must specifically swear that he is a resident of the electoral district in which he is tendering his vote. I do object, therefore, to seeing this provision cut out when it might as well be left in.

Mr. MEIGHEN: It is still there, and can be used. Section 153 will lose none of its force in the coming election by virtue of this Act. It says:

> Except in the provinces of Saskatchewan and Alberta and the Yukon Territory, an elector, if required by the deputy returning officer, the poll clerk, one of the candidates, or an agent of a candidate, or by any elector present, shall, before receiving his ballot paper, take such oath of qualification as by the laws of the province he may in the like case at a provincial election be required to take, such changes having been made in the form of oath as are necessary to make it applicable to the election being held.

Make it applicable to this election, and the man is bound to be qualified by residence in order that he may be enabled to vote. The hon. gentleman can make up an affidavit in accordance with that, and if the man refuses to take it he cannot vote.

Mr. CARVELL: I cannot make up an affidavit. All any person can do is to ask the man to take the oath provided by law.

Mr. MEIGHEN: By the provincial law.

Mr. CARVELL: Is section 153 allowed to stand?

Mr. MEIGHEN: Yes.

Mr. CARVELL: My hon. friend does not specifically repeal it, but he does so in effect by the provisions of section 65 of this Act. Section 65 says:

Every voter shall be entitled to vote whose name is on the voters' list and has not been erased therefrom in accordance with the foregoing provisions of this part.

We could demand that a man take the vote according to the new form Z, but that is not sufficient. A person who, for a consideration, comes to the poll with the avowed purpose of voting when he knows he has no right to do so, asserts that he is qualified to vote. If you make him swear that he is a resident of the electoral district in which he tenders his vote, then you can get after him with a warrant five minutes afterwards. That is what we want him to swear, and that is why section 153 was put in. That provision has been useful to us. I suggest that section 153 should read this way:

Every voter shall be entitled to vote whose name is on the voters' list and has not been erased therefrom in accordance with the foregoing provisions of this Part, and subject to the provisions of section 153.

Just add those words. Then you will retain the rights given us by section 153.

Mr. MEIGHEN: The rights are still retained even if you do not do that. The hon. member for South Renfrew (Mr. Graham) is not in agreement with my hon. friend.

Mr. CARVELL: I think the hon. member for South Renfrew and I are entirely in agreement in regard to the matter.

Mr. MEIGHEN: Does the hon. member say that, if at the end of section 65, you make section 153 the dominating section, then in Ontario a man who is on the list, say in the county of Renfrew, and who has moved into the county of Leeds, a sufficiently long time to disqualify him in the county of Renfrew, could, under the provincial law, still vote in the county of Renfrew? I am afraid he could not.

Mr. GRAHAM: I do not think he could. The hon. member for Carleton and I had a little conversation. The point I had in mind was this. I was anxious to have some oath that the man who is on the list confirmed by this measure could be asked to take as to his right to vote. He may have got on the voters' list without having any right to get on.

Mr. MEIGHEN: When he got on?

Mr. GRAHAM: Yes. He may have got on wrongly. I see the difficulty the Secretary of State is in. By accepting this provision, as he says, a man who had moved out of the county would be prevented from coming back and voting, and consequently he would have no vote. Would it meet the purposes of my hon. friend from Carleton if the man had to swear that he was a resident of the province?

Mr. CARVELL: No.

Mr. MEIGHEN: That is the difficulty.

Mr. GRAHAM: It would hardly be fair to say, so far as Ontario is concerned, that a man should have to swear he was a resident of that riding, because provision is made in this Bill that a man having removed from the riding and, I suppose, being still in Canada—

Mr. MEIGHEN: Yes.

Mr. GRAHAM: —should have a right to return. If not, he would not have a right to vote in this election.

Mr. MEIGHEN: That is it exactly.

Mr. CARVELL: I have another suggestion to make, which will not interfere with the condition of affairs in Ontario. We have, in a dozen places in this measure, made certain provision respecting one, two or three provinces. Therefore, we are not violating any principle if we make a special provision for a special province. I would suggest that section 65 read:

Every voter shall be entitled to vote whose name is on the voters' list and has not been erased therefrom in accordance with the foregoing provisions of this Part and in the province of New Brunswick subject to the provisions of section 153.

Mr. MEIGHEN: I find it very hard to agree with that, for the reason that the cases of the two provinces are identical.

Mr. CARVELL: I may be in error in that. This is the law in our province: If a man's name is upon the list, say, in the county of Carleton, and he moves to the city of St. John just before an election, he must vote in the constituency in which he resides. All he has to do is to apply to the secretary-treasurer who is the custodian of the list in the county of Carleton and obtain from him a certificate which he takes to the secretary-treasurer of the city of St. John, and this entitles him to vote in the city of St. John. That is the way in which we work it out.

Mr. EDWARDS: Is there no time limit fixed?

Mr. CARVELL: No.

Mr. EDWARDS: Would that be the case even if the man went the day before an election?

Mr. CARVELL: If he became a bona fide resident of the city of St. John the day before the election and became a qualified voter under the authority of that certificate, he would be entitled to vote.

Mr. EDWARDS: The case is not the same in Ontario.

Mr. GRAHAM: That is the difference.

Mr. CARVELL: A good many people have moved into New Brunswick just a few days before election. What I have stated is the law, so that you do not deprive the man of his vote by applying section 153 to him. He has the right to take his vote with him.

Mr. MEIGHEN: Not under this law.

Mr. CARVELL: No, under our law he has the right to take his vote with him. I feel, therefore, that some provision should be made by which we can retain the provisions of section 153.

Mr. MEIGHEN: The hon. gentleman must understand that is not a matter of qualification, and consequently, that did not, under the old law, become the practice. Certainly, under his measure, that practice does not exist. That practice could not be followed under the scheme of this Bill so that, as far as this election is concerned, Ontario and New Brunswick are precisely in the same condition, and I do not see what reason any one could give for adopting one rule in one province and another in another. Besides that, the legislation would look very much butchered. We have to get on one foot or the other. We have to take the provincial lists that are there as final, or not. If we do not take them as final, then it means virtually a total revision, or, in other words, new lists. If the hon. member for Carleton really wants new lists, I do not think I would have any objections to having them.

Mr. CARVELL: By enumerators? The Lord forbid!

Mr. MEIGHEN: You could call them registrars. If the hon. gentleman wants seventy-five per cent of the list completed now and final, I think it has to stay that way. I do not see how we can invade the list and, at the same time, preserve the principle at all.

Mr. GLASS: That is exactly the point we were discussing last night. I think the principle ought to be accepted that a citizen of Canada who is qualified to vote should not be disqualified because he has moved from one part of the country to another. We have adopted the principle that there should be one vote for each man. The provisions in New Brunswick, as the hon. member for Carleton has stated, cover that point to a certain extent—but I do not think as fairly as they should—to allow that man to return and vote in the constituency in which he was on the list provided that he was not on the list in any other part of the country. It does not seem to be right that any citizen of this country who has voting qualifications, if by reason of business necessity or otherwise he has moved into another part and has not been in that district a sufficient length of time to be on the list, should be in the position of an alien and entirely disfranchised. Provided that a man is on the list only in one constituency and has been continuously resident in this country and is qualified in one constituency, he cannot have been away very long, and I do not see why he should be deprived of his vote. So far as justice to the voter is concerned, it would give precisely the same conditions as exist in New Brunswick except that the voter would return to the place in which he was on the list instead of voting in the place in which he resides.

Mr. CARVELL: I do not think he would have a vote there at all under Form Z.

Mr. MEIGHEN: In this connection there is a point that came to my notice which is virtually akin to this, and perhaps it will help the discussion if I mention it now. The qualifications as to the women and men who are put on the list are, amongst other things, that they shall be qualified as to age, race and residence, according to the law of the province. A thorough investigation has shown that the law of the province cannot be made applicable from the point of view of residence. Consequently there has to be a definition of residence in so far as it applies to all names that go on. But the hon. member for Carleton is referring, not to names that go on, but to names that are on. In so far as names that go on are concerned we are going to move an amendment to cover the matter of residence. For example, in the province of Ontario I think it is, the residence qualification is a certain number of months prior to some work of the assessor. Plainly that cannot be made applicable here at all. And there are similar difficulties in other provinces. Consequently, it is intended to make a uniform residence qualification throughout the whole Dominion for all men and women who are on the lists,

the other qualifications being left as they are.

Mr. BUREAU: That would not apply, I suppose, in the province of Quebec, because no man can be added to the list according to 65 A.

Mr. MEIGHEN: No, it only applies to women.

Mr. GRAHAM: The objection of the hon. member for Carleton, as I understand it, is that men not resident in Canada at all may come in and vote. I think we could shut out the vote that might be brought in from across the line by adding to Form Z No. 1, after the word "British subject" the words "a resident of Canada."

Mr. MEIGHEN: I am inclined to think that that could be done, if it will suit the needs of the hon. member for Carleton.

Mr. CARVELL: It will get rid of most of the difficulty. Let me give an illustration. In our country we have many cases where a man may be revised in two counties. Perhaps he has land in both counties, and he goes on the assessment list. Of course, he should be removed from the county in which he does not reside. He might attempt to vote twice, but that is a local affair, and it is watched pretty closely. If my hon. friend would insert the words "a resident of Canada" I think it would about meet the case.

Mr. MEIGHEN: I beg to move that Form Z No. 1 be amended by adding after the word "subject" in the third line thereof the words "a resident of Canada."

Amendment agreed to.

Mr. MEIGHEN: I move:

That section 1 of the Bill be amended by striking out of the fourth line of the amended section 48, paragraph (j) of the Bill, the word "ten" and substituting therefor the word "fifteen."

This is to make the period between the posting up and the election day fifteen days instead of ten.

Amendment agreed to.

Mr. MEIGHEN: I move:

That section 1 of the Bill be amended by striking out of the sixth line of paragraph (k) of the amended section 48 the word "three" and substituting therefor the word "five."

Amendment agreed to.

Mr. MEIGHEN: I move:

That section 1 of the Bill be amended by striking out of the seventh line of paragraph (l) of the amended section 48, the word "three" and substituting therefor the word "five."

Mr. BUREAU: What is the substance of the amendment?

Mr. MEIGHEN: Prior to this Bill, in the provinces where enumeration applied, the enumerator had to post up his lists as complete as he could get them eight days before election day, in the post office, on the polling booth, and so on; and he had to sit as a Court of Revision until two days before election day, when the list was complete as far as there was a list at all. Now instead of making it eight days and two days, we are making it fifteen and five days.

Amendment agreed to.

Mr. GLASS: Referring to Form Z No. 1, sometimes difficulty arises in connection with the interpretation of what is meant by "a resident of Canada". We occasionally have cases where men are temporarily outside the bounds of Canada, but their families are still resident in Canada. I think it should be understood that a man is held to be domiciled where his family resides.

Mr. MEIGHEN: The courts have interpreted it. Under the court rulings the man described by my hon. friend would be a resident of Canada.

Mr. GLASS: But it is a question of how it may be interpreted for the time being by the returning officer.

Mr. MEIGHEN: No.

Mr. GLASS: If that matter could be explained to a voter who was conscientious, so that he would know the fact that his family residing here would justify him in taking the oath—

Mr. MEIGHEN: I think it would be better to have it explained to him.

Mr. CARVELL: The Solicitor General is quite right in his interpretation of the law. A man resides where his family is.

Mr. MEIGHEN: I move:

That section 1 be amended by inserting at the end of paragraph (n) of section 1 the words "and by striking out from the second line of section 57 the words 'nine o'clock in the forenoon' and inserting instead the words 'the opening of the polls.'"

This is necessary because the opening of the poll in certain cities is at six o'clock instead of at nine o'clock.

Mr. BUREAU: That is not in the Bill; it is only in the reprint.

Mr. A. K. MACLEAN: You may not be able to amend in that way. You are amending a section which is not in the Bill before the House. You are referring only to the amending Bill.

Mr. MEIGHEN: The effect of the amendment I have just read is to change "nine o'clock in the forenoon" to "the opening of the poll," so as to make it applicable to all polls, no matter when they opened.

Mr. MORPHY: Will the Secretary of State permit me a word in connection with the opening of the poll? Section 136 of some Bill I have in hand—and it is very difficult to tell what we are working on—deals with certain cities, the cities of Calgary, Edmonton, Halifax, Hamilton, London, Montreal, Ottawa, Quebec, Regina, St. John, Toronto, Vancouver, Victoria and Winnipeg wherein the polls shall be open at the hour of six o'clock in the morning. As I may not be present when this section comes up for discussion, I would like to say that the city of Stratford, in the constituency of North Perth, which I have the honour to represent, is a large railway centre, and the early trains leave that city every morning except Sunday long before the usual hour for the opening of the polls. These trains leave for Buffalo, Port Dover, Toronto Montreal, Owen Sound, London, Detroit, Sarnia, main line to Chicago, and Goderich division and on only one of these divisions is it possible for the train crews to poll their votes. I think the city of Stratford should be included in this list, as it is one of the largest railway centres in the province of Ontario.

Mr. MEIGHEN: This is a question on which I think the committee should be guided largely by the views of the members who know most about the cities. If it is in the public interest in any city that the polls should open at six o'clock instead of at nine o'clock, we want the Bill to read that they shall open at six o'clock. I may say I have also been requested to add the city of St. Thomas to the list. I think it would be a great advantage to the committee if hon. members would carefully review the ground, and let the committee have the benefit of their ideas as to how the section should be amended, if it needs amendment at all. There is no reason why the city of Stratford should not be added to the list if it is going to be a public convenience. At the same time we do not want to impose on cities that do not need it the necessity of opening the poll at six o'clock in the morning.

Mr. GLASS: I think nearly all divisional points on the railways would be in the same position.

Mr. MORPHY: I would like to have an expression from the Secretary of State to the effect that no matter what other members of the House will say or do, he will put Stratford in the Bill.

Mr. MEIGHEN: I am quite ready to do so.

Mr. A. K. MACLEAN: At the opening of the session this afternoon, I asked the Secretary of State if since last evening he had taken into consideration the enfranchisement of relatives of persons serving in the Canadian navy within Canada. He informed me it was not the intention to limit the enfranchisement to those without Canada. At the time I was not sure whether I should be in order in pressing my point, and I abandoned it for the time being. Now, however the discussion is quite free and open, and I wish again to direct attention to this matter. I do not think it is wise or necessary to enfranchise the female relatives of those serving in the Canadian navy within Canada. I understand this Bill is based upon the principle that we have a great number of men serving abroad in France and elsewhere in Europe; many of them on account of death of course will not be able to vote. In introducing this Bill, the Secretary of State expressed the view that it would be but proper if some of the relatives of those deceased soldiers should have the right to vote.

He urged as another justification for the Bill the fact that the influence of the soldiers was lost. They had an opportunity of voting but they had not an opportunity of exercising any influence during the campaign in Canada. That is another of the two grounds upon which he justified this Bill when introducing it. That ground does not apply to the naval forces. Surely within Canada the relatives of this class ought not to be given the franchise. They have an opportunity of exercising their influence in Canada, and I cannot understand upon what principle my hon. friend desires to enfranchise the female relatives of these men. I submit that it should not be done. According to the statement read to the committee this afternoon by the Minister of Marine and Fisheries, it includes some

classes of people who, in the strict sense of the term, are not engaged in the naval service. In that statement the minister says:

> It would also include the relatives of men employed in clerical positions in Ottawa, Halifax or elsewhere who never sailed in a ship and are employed continually ashore.

I submit that it is not fair to extend the franchise to the female relatives of men employed in the dock yards at Halifax or in the naval service department here at Ottawa. Proceeding further the statement says:

> It would also include the relatives of officers serving in Canada on Imperial duty such as the officers of the Naval Patrol in Halifax, the staff in charge of the dispatch of convoys at Sydney,

And so on. There is no particular reason why the relatives of this class should be enfranchised. I find, according to the statement, that on the east coast of Canada there are 149 boys and on the west coast 53. Their female relatives will be enfranchised. If the minister would apply the principles upon which he justified the Bill itself, to this part of the Bill referring to the naval service, he would strike out the words "within or" at the bottom of the first page. The female relatives of men serving in the military forces of Canada, and within Canada, are not enfranchised; why should the relatives of those engaged in the naval service in Canada be enfranchised? Why not apply the same principle to both the military and naval forces? I understood last evening that the Prime Minister and the Secretary of State were rather disposed to view this application of mine favourably. No reason was given this afternoon in justification of this particular section. I hope the minister will see his way clear to restrict the application of this clause.

Mr. DAVIDSON: I regret that I am not able to agree with the hon. the junior member for Halifax and I am a little surprised that an hon. gentleman who favours the extension of the franchise to all women should wish to restrict it in this way. I should think that if he were in favour of universal suffrage he would be glad to have it extended as far as possible and that if he could not get the whole loaf he would want the half loaf to be as large as possible.

Mr. A. K. MACLEAN: I cannot follow that line of reasoning.

Mr. DAVIDSON: I am sorry if the hon. gentleman cannot follow my argument. There is a great distinction as far as the peril and danger is concerned between the soldiers doing garrison duty, or training in Canada, and the sailors on a ship along our coast. I think there could be no more dangerous avocation than that followed by those brave men who to-day are protecting the shores and coasts of eastern Canada. They are watching out for mines, they are continually menaced by the danger of striking an unknown mine, of being torpedoed, of running into a hostile ship, and the dangers of the sea. There is no more hazardous occupation than that which is followed by the brave men to whom I desire to tender this well-deserved tribute. I believe the anguish that is suffered by the relatives of those brave men is almost as great as that which is endured by the women relatives of those who are at the front.

Mr. A. K. MACLEAN: Where does this anguish come in? What is the cause of all this anguish on the part of the relatives of men employed on some ships in Halifax who only do about two hours' work a day?

Mr. DAVIDSON: I am afraid that my hon. friend is hard of heart.

Mr. A. K. MACLEAN: No, he is not at all. Tell me where this anguish comes from.

Mr. DAVIDSON: Any good woman, when her husband is exposed to danger on the sea, naturally suffers anguish, and these men who go out even for two hours on the Atlantic coast brave the danger of submarines, hostile craft and inclement weather. They are in a most dangerous position. The suffering and anguish of their female relatives is akin to that suffered by the female relatives of men at the front.

Mr. A. K. MACLEAN: My hon. friend must be thinking of phantom ships of the enemy or "ships that pass in the night." Surely he is not talking about real ships of the enemy that are a menace to these Canadian ships of ours?

Mr. DAVIDSON: I am surprised that my hon. friend would refer to the Canadian navy as a phantom. I am astounded at the hon. gentleman contending that there are no dangers on the ocean these days. It is full of dangers and there could be no more hazardous occupation than that which is followed by these men. From the standpoint of suffering for the cause and for the flag, we are abundantly justified in giving the brave women relatives of these sailors the privilege of the franchise and

I sincerely trust that it will not be denied them by this statute.

Mr. A. K. MACLEAN: This Bill will enfranchise the female relatives of 57 wireless operators on the Atlantic coast and 35 on the West coast. Does my hon. friend mean to tell me that the wives and sisters and mothers of these men employed as wireless operators have to undergo anguish? Are these wireless operators exposed to great dangers and menaces of any kind?

Mr. DAVIDSON: I say emphatically that wireless operators are exposed to danger. And I would ask my hon. friend if there are no mines along the Atlantic coast, if there is no danger from that source, what in the world are these men doing cruising and searching for them?

Mr. A. K. MACLEAN: They are not doing much of it.

Mr. DAVIDSON: But every day they are out.

Mr. A. K. MACLEAN: Once in a while.

Mr. DAVIDSON: I happen to know that they are out.

Mr. A. K. MACLEAN: I should like to hear from the Secretary of State as to my suggestion to amend this Bill. The hon. member for Annapolis (Mr. Davidson) is subject to some hallucination about this matter. The protection of our coast is really performed by the ships of the British Navy which are stationed upon the coast. There are a great number of small steamers in the harbour of Halifax whose officers and crews, I believe, come within this Bill—three or four times more than are necessary; half of them might be dispensed with entirely. They are exposed to no such dangers as my hon. friend would have this committee believe.

Mr. NESBITT: It might rain on them.

Mr. A. K. MACLEAN: When this Bill was presented to the House by the Solicitor General, he laid stress on the fact that it gave the franchise to the female relatives of overseas soldiers who, by reason of their absence, were unable to exercise any influence in the coming election in this country. I can understand this ground, although I do not believe in it; but why should it apply to men to the navy?

Mr. MEIGHEN: I believe in both grounds and therefore support the Bill; but I cannot understand the hon. member who says he does not believe in these grounds at all and still does not want the line pressed one inch beyond them. I am willing to concede that the ground of absence and consequent loss of influence among the electorate is eliminated in the case of those who spend a considerable part of their time on shore with their fellows; but the other ground of sacrifice, the exposure of husbands or sons to the perils of war, applies to those whose husbands and sons are serving in the navy for the protection of our coast. If that is not so, let us say that the whole coast defence is a fake, and that the whole idea of a Canadian navy for coast defence is a fraud. I do not think the hon. member for Halifax (Mr. A. K. Maclean) would want to take that ground. I never contended that there was not need for coast defence even in peace, and I believe that to-day there is need for every kind of coast defence. I also believe that those engaged in it are exposed to the same perils in mine-sweeping and so on as in any other form of service.

9 p.m.

Mr. A. K. MACLEAN: Where is the mine-sweeping being done in Canada?

Mr. MEIGHEN: The Minister of Marine told us this afternoon where it was done.

Mr. A. K. MACLEAN: I do not believe there is any mine sweeping outside of the harbours of Sydney and Halifax, and possibly in the river St. Lawrence.

Mr. MEIGHEN: I have to take my information from the Department of Marine. The minister said that extensive mine-sweeping operations were going on in connection with the coast patrol.

Mr. A. K. MACLEAN: There may be some patrolling, but no such thing as mine-sweeping on the coast.

Mr. MEIGHEN: That is dangerous.

Mr. A. K. MACLEAN: No, it is not.

Mr. BUREAU: Before six o'clock I was suggesting an amendment to the Solicitor General in the definition of persons who could give a right to vote to their female relatives. The Solicitor General raised an objection that would disappear if he yielded to the demand of the hon. member for Halifax. I suggested the use of the words "military elector" in place of the word "person." He objected that the word military elector might include people in camp in Canada who had never been overseas. The clause already provides for that in respect to the military forces. The soldier who has not gone across the seas cannot

give the vote to his female relations. If a similar clause were inserted in relation to the naval force, everything would be all right. I do not see why a difference should be made between the man who serves in the navy and the man who serves in the land forces.

Mr. MEIGHEN: I think my hon. friend's suggestion had far more value than he attributes to it. His suggestion was to substitute for "person" in 33a "military elector" on the first page of the amending Act, limiting "military elector to those who had not left the Canadian shores. The great value of the suggestion was that as the Act stands, a man who enlisted and deserted perhaps a week afterwards is placed in the same position as a man who is still fighting in Flanders; his relatives have the right to vote just as do the relatives of the bona fide soldier. My hon. friend suggests that that class of relatives should not be enfranchised; certainly they should not be. I propose to meet my hon. friend fully on that point. Indeed, I am obliged to him for the suggestion, because it is wrong that the relatives of a deserter should be given the vote under any principle embodied in this Bill.

Mr. BUREAU: How does my hon. friend differentiate between the man serving in the military and land forces and the man serving in the naval forces? As I understand it, the moment a man in the naval forces goes outside the three-mile limit he has gone overseas for the purpose of service.

Mr. MEIGHEN: You could never tell whether a man was just outside the three-mile limit or not.

Mr. BUREAU: "Without Canada" are the words used in the Act.

Mr. MEIGHEN: "Without Canada" legally means beyond the three-mile limit. Actual war service is frequently performed by members of the naval forces within the three-mile limit along the Canadian coast. The war service of a man in the military forces is not so performed; his active service is performed overseas. That is the difference. The men who are guarding the Canadian coasts are engaged in war service. It is conceivable that that service may become even more perilous than service overseas.

Mr. A. K. MACLEAN: Does the Secretary of State justify the enfranchisement of female relatives of those engaged in the naval service upon the ground that the latter are subjected to peril?

Mr. MEIGHEN: That they are engaged in actual war service involving peril.

Mr. A. K. MACLEAN: I suppose some of them are engaged in war service, but in many instances it is almost a commercial transaction. For instance, there are 92 wireless operators in the naval service of Canada. Does the work of a wireless operator constitute war service in the strictest sense of the term? Is that not a purely commercial occupation?

Mr. MEIGHEN: I do not think they are in the naval service.

Mr. A. K. MACLEAN: They are in the naval service, according to the statement made this afternoon by the Minister of the Naval Service. In Halifax harbour probably a dozen motor boats and steamers are operated by the Government, whereas three or four, or at least half the number, would be sufficient.

Mr. MEIGHEN: What are they doing?

Mr. A. K. MACLEAN: Some of them do nothing. A good many of them hardly ever go outside the mouth of the harbour. Some of them are engaged in the mine-sweeping in the harbour which is not a hazardous occupation.

Mr. CARVELL: They are practising mine-sweeping.

Mr. A. K. MACLEAN: They are under instructions from the British Admiralty to sweep Halifax harbour for mines every day. They may be practising, but I suppose that work has to be done in any case. In many instances, these steamers have been chartered from individuals. In taking over the steamers, the Government took over the crew; automatically, I suppose, the men entered the naval service. Surely my hon. friend cannot justify the extension of the franchise to the female relatives of these men on the ground that they are subjected to peril or that they are actually engaged in war service.

Mr. MEIGHEN: I suppose the hon. gentleman would take the same position in regard to the men engaged in forestry work in France. There is a minimum of peril there, I should think. You cannot distinguish between one war service and another.

Mr. CURRIE: Is it not a fact that about a year ago a number of men were lost off

the patrol boat Grilse? These are the men whom he speaks of as not being engaged in perilous service.

Mr. A. K. MACLEAN: It is true that the Grilse on her way from Halifax to Bermuda met with disaster and some lives were lost. That steamer should not have been sent to sea at the time.

Mr. CURRIE: The same thing is liable to occur to any one of the boats in this patrol service.

Mr. A. K. MACLEAN: She was the largest boat on the east coast engaged in patrol service. The case of the Grilse is evidence of the fact that the greater part of the patrol service down there is unnecessary. The Grilse never performed any large amount of service while there; she never should have been sent there. She is capable of real service, not on the Canadian coast but on the coast of the United Kingdom, on account of her great speed.

Mr. CURRIE: The hon. gentleman knows that this patrol service extends far beyond Newfoundland. Several Newfoundland harbours are patrolled in the same way.

Mr. A. K. MACLEAN: I do not know it, and I doubt very much whether my hon. friend does.

Mr. CURRIE: We are informing the hon. gentleman now of the facts.

Mr. A. K. MACLEAN: Who is informing me?

Mr. CURRIE: You cannot tell what moment a submarine will arrive off the coast of Nova Scotia and blow up one of the fishing towns.

Mr. A. K. MACLEAN: I do not accept my hon. friend as an authority on this matter. Men much more familiar with matters of this kind than the Secretary of State, the member for North Simcoe (Mr. Currie) or myself, say that the patrol service on the Atlantic coast is largely unnecessary—and I believe that is a fact. I should like the minister to give the committe some reason for retaining in the Bill as it now stands the clause to which I refer. Is it not peculiar that the female relatives of wireless operators should be enfranchised? A great number of men in this service in the city of Halifax never go to sea. Possibly there may be grounds of extending the franchise to some female relatives in some cases, but it is unnecessary and unfair to leave the provision so broad and so unrestricted as it is in its present form.

Mr. MEIGHEN: It is putting me at an unfair advantage to ask me to defend the Naval Department and to proceed on the assumption that the Naval Department is making a fraud of its work. I am not the Minister of Naval Service, but I am satisfied that the hon. gentleman's allegations in that regard are not founded upon fact. Wireless operators surely go out to sea. I assume that the mine-sweepers have wireless operators on board—men who are enlisted in the naval forces. What is the difference between a man who is a wireless operator on a mine-sweeper and a man who is a paymaster of a battalion? There are degrees of peril, degrees of service, degrees of hard work, endurance, suffering. You cannot draw an exact line in that respect.

Mr. A. K. MACLEAN: Quite a number of wireless operators perform service on land.

Mr. MEIGHEN: I assume they are sometimes on land and sometimes on ship. Take the men engaged in construction and forestry work; some of them are working in England; some of them may at no time be in France. The only bold line you can draw—the fairest line, without going into details in individual cases—is the line between active war service and something there is not war service of any kind. If we did everything with absolute fairness, if that were possible at all, we would give to the poor fellow in the front line who goes over the parapet about twenty-five votes, and to the fellow in England one. We cannot do those things.

Mr. A. K. MACLEAN: Let me remind the Secretary of State that at Halifax two regiments, which were called out at the commencement of the war by compulsion, are still performing service. Many of them are very much inconvenienced thereby. Many have been taken from their business, and would like to-day to avoid service and to return to their ordinary occupations. Are not the female relatives of those men just as much entitled to the franchise as many of those engaged in the naval service? They are performing war service.

Mr. ARTHURS: Have any of those men been refused the right to go overseas?

Mr. A. K. MACLEAN: I do not see what that has to do with the matter.

Mr. ARTHURS: It certainly has a great deal to do with it. Those men perhaps have no desire to go overseas.

Mr. A. K. MACLEAN: A great many of them have gone. The regiment is changing all the time.

Mr. DAVIDSON: My hon. friend from Halifax (Mr. A. K. Maclean) takes altogether too complacent a view of the marine situation in this country. It is rather a habit with hon. gentlemen opposite not really to appreciate danger until it actually comes. We remember only a few months ago that there was, according to my hon. friends opposite, no emergency in this country, notwithstanding the fact that Germany was preparing up to the hilt for war. They could see no danger. They cried "wolf," and laughed at the Prime Minister when he spoke about the rumblings and lightnings on the national horizon. I am surprised that my hon. friend, who has so long represented a marine constituency, does not appreciate the very great danger that besets the men that go down to the sea in ships, particularly warships, even in time of peace. If he will allow his memory to go back only a few years, he will remember that the Canadian warship, the Niobe, when the sky was clear, when there was no war, went down to attend a social function at Yarmouth during Home Week. There were no submarines, no mines, nothing of that kind. Yet that gallant ship came to grief even in time of peace. How very different those times are from now. We know that submarines have visited this side of the Atlantic—and not phantom submarines, by any means. Was it a phantom submarine that arrived off Nantucket a few months ago and sank a number of British ships? I think not. It is an open secret to all who live along the Nova Scotia coast that there is a great menace arising in that way. My hon. friend makes light of these dangers because the Government is not, for many reasons, able to give all the information it might give under other circumstances in reference to this matter. But if there was no peril there, hon. gentlemen opposite would probably not have made the clamour for protection that they have made in this House on more than one occasion. We all remember how eloquently the hon. member for Pictou (Mr. Macdonald) criticised and denounced the Government for not taking any precautions. Those craft sweep not only Halifax harbour, but the coast of Nova Scotia, and it is an open secret, with at least every longshoreman in Halifax, that they go as far as Newfoundland, and I have a notion that my hon. friend has a suspicion of that fact also. He says that because some of these people at certain times merely go out in Halifax harbour to look for mines, they confront no danger. Since this war began, one or two dreadnoughts have blown up in harbours.

Mr. A. K. MACLEAN: What harbours in Canada?

Mr. DAVIDSON: I am not speaking about Canada.

Mr. A. K. MACLEAN: We are.

Mr. DAVIDSON: Warships have been blown up a very short distance from our harbours. My hon. friends from Quebec cannot see any danger to this country because they do not hear the peal of the guns.

Mr. BUREAU: The members from Quebec see better than you do.

Mr. DAVIDSON: My hon. friend cannot see that a menace that would visit English harbours might, also, in the space of a few hours, visit a harbour on this side of the Atlantic.

Mr. BUREAU: What is an English harbour?

Mr. DAVIDSON: I would almost think an English harbour would be a harbour in England.

Mr. C. A. WILSON: A harbour speaking English?

Mr. DAVIDSON: Would the hon. gentleman repeat his question? I did not catch what he said.

Mr. GAUVREAU: Go on, or shut up.

Mr. DAVIDSON: I may be digressing, but I do not think I am taking such liberties of speech as my hon. friends are doing when they go down to address anti-conscription meetings in Quebec. My hon. friend, who indulges in discourse himself, might permit me the privilege of addressing a few words to the committee on behalf of those very deserving people who, while my hon. friends, in many instances, are safely and snugly in bed, are facing all kinds of danger to protect our coast. I think it is very unkind and unjust to assert that the services of those noble men is absolutely free from danger and is unnecessary.

Mr. A. K. MACLEAN: We are not doing anything to those men.

Mr. MEIGHEN: I think the amendment I moved some time ago has not been carried. The only effect of it is to make one of the

sections applicable to a class of polls open at six o'clock instead of at nine. It is unnecessary if certain polls are to open at six o'clock. It would be well to have that amendment carried.

Mr. L. A. LAPOINTE: What section is that?

Mr. MEIGHEN: It is an amendment to paragraph (n) of the amending Act. These words are added at the end of the paragraph:

> And by striking out from the second line of section 57 the words "nine o'clock in the forenoon" and inserting instead the words, "the opening of the poll."

Mr. L. A. LAPOINTE: What would be the time the poll opened?

Mr. MEIGHEN: In the larger cities, at six o'clock in the morning and everywhere else at nine.

Mr. L. A. LAPOINTE: What time at night would they close?

Mr. MEIGHEN: The same hour as always—five o'clock.

Mr. L. A. LAPOINTE: I think the desire of the labouring classes would be that the polls should remain open later at night instead of opening at this hour in the morning. They generally go to work at seven in the morning. In the cities, instead of closing at five, the polls should close at nine. In Montreal we struck an average and made it eight o'clock for closing. If you were making it about eight o'clock you would deserve some credit.

Mr. MEIGHEN: The point is this. There is a clause in the Act which enables any labourer to vote. His employer has to allow him to go, and consequently he does not need to vote at six o'clock in the morning but he has the privilege if he so desires. If the extra hour were put on at the end instead of at the beginning of the day, it would not be of any value to the railroad men at all. They would be away, and they do not come back in time. It would, also, not be of any value to the traveller, especially if the election day were on a Monday, which is the best day for him. The opening is fixed at six o'clock in the morning to enable those classes to vote before they leave and also to enable the labourer to vote before seven o'clock if he so desires.

Mr. L. A. LAPOINTE: Most of the engineers and train crews have left the station by seven or seven-thirty, and does my hon. friend believe that all these men will have had time to vote between six and seven o'clock?

Mr. MEIGHEN: I think in this election every engineer and conductor in Canada will see to it that he gets a chance to vote between six and seven o'clock.

Mr. L. A. LAPOINTE: I am not complaining about the polls opening at six, but I think we should give these men and the labouring class an opportunity to vote by keeping the polls open later at night.

Mr. C. A. WILSON: They are going to "railroad" this election.

Mr. GRAHAM: I think I have discovered a solution for all these difficulties. There are two classes in Canada who are away from home a great deal. The men of one class never know when they are going to be home, and the other class may know that they are going to be home for week-end; I refer to railroad men and commercial travellers. In this Bill there is a clause providing for the opening of the polls in certain cities within municipalities at 6 a.m. This is ostensibly for the purpose of allowing railroad men and commercial travellers, and any others who may so desire, to vote early in the morning, it being presumed that commercial travellers and railroad men will be leaving home early in the morning. This provision will be of some benefit, no doubt, but as regards railway men it does not begin to meet their case. Every person who has lived in a railway centre, large or small, knows that railway men are liable to be called out at any hour of the day or night. It has very frequently occurred in my experience that crews have been called out at ten or eleven, or early in the morning, and they would be away from home long before six o'clock, and their runs would not alow them to return in time to cast their vote. The same thing might be said with regard to commercial travellers, though perhaps not to the same extent, because some commercial travellers at least can get home for polling day, but those who have a large territory to cover cannot do it. In the province of Saskatchewan special provision has been made for taking the vote of railway men and commercial travellers. In some of the states of the Union it is provided that an elector can vote wherever he is. He is not deprived of his vote by travelling, no matter how far away he may be from his own constituency. I would not suggest that we go as far as that, but would urge the Secretary

of State, now that we are dealing with this matter, to avoid the necessity of naming city after city, and town after town—as will have to be the case, and as is the case—by providing a clause similar to that in the Saskatchewan Act which would be applicable to every terminal point of a railway. That would cover the railway men's vote at any rate. The Saskatchewan Act strikes me as being very simple, and I think it is surrounded with all the necessary safeguards. If the committee will permit me, I will read one or two sections from their Act. Section 286 reads as follows:

> Section 287 to 295 inclusive of this Act shall apply only to railway employees, commercial travellers and other persons whose employment or calling is such as to necessitate from time to time their absence from their places of residence, who are qualified electors under this Act in the electoral divisions or portions of electoral divisions mentioned in form 57 in the schedule to this Act, and who have reason to believe that they will be absent from their places of residence on the day fixed by the writ for the election.
>
> 287. For the purpose of enabling every such person to vote at any election held in the said electoral divisions the returning officer shall establish a special polling place in the city or town mentioned in form 57 in the schedule hereto as forming the whole or part of such division, which polling place shall be centrally located so as to suit the convenience of the voters.

The next section gives the method by which the vote is to be taken. Then section 289 reads:

> The poll at each such polling place so established shall be open between the hours of seven and ten o'clock in the afternoon on the three days exclusive of Sunday immediately preceding the day of election.

That is, the poll is open from seven to ten in the evening for three days previous to polling day, so that all the railway men and commercial travellers may register their votes on one of those three preceding days. Every night the ballot boxes are sealed, just as is done in an ordinary election. The ballots are perfectly safe, and are not counted until the end of the proper polling day. That seems to me to be a pretty simple provision, which I think could well be worked into this Act. Any one who has had anything to do with elections in a railway centre has felt the necessity for some better provision than we have ever had for allowing the railway men to vote. It is not the fault of the railway men if they are ordered out and must go. "First in, first out"; if it is their turn to go, they cannot remain. A provision such as is in the Saskatchewan Act would remove all possibility of manipulation. For instance, the superintendent, or the man at the head of a railway company, who is friendly to one candidate has it in his power to order out the crews who do not agree with his views, and keep the men in who do agree with his views. There has been a good deal of complaint about that, and it is not fair to the men themselves. The railway men, who take a very deep interest in public affairs are very often unable to cast their votes, and I think it would only be doing justice to these men to have a provision in this Act such as I have mentioned.

The same thing might be said with regard to commercial travellers. When a member of the Government I was waited on by both these bodies on several occasions, and urged to devise means whereby they could vote. I suggested several methods, but the men handling the justice end of the Government did not see it my way. I have observed that the Saskatchewan Act meets in a large measure what I have in mind, and if the minister could adopt something of that kind it would cover the case and meet the wishes of the railway men, commercial travellers, and others of that class, and also the wishes of those for whom the hon. member for North Perth (Mr. Morphy) has spoken.

Mr. L. A. LAPOINTE: In the city of Montreal the municipal elections are always held on a Monday, to enable commercial travellers to vote. The Association of Commercial Travellers had represented for a long time that Monday would be the most convenient day for them. Why should not the Government decide that the election shall be on a Monday? They might even go so far as to fix the date in the Bill, but perhaps that would be asking too much. I think it is my duty to move that the polls be kept open until eight o'clock at night, and I beg to move accordingly, seconded by the hon. member for Wright (Mr. Devlin).

Mr. BUREAU: Does the Solicitor General intend to close the poll at six o'clock in the evening?

Mr. L. A. LAPOINTE: No, five o'clock.

Mr. BUREAU: The hon. gentleman said just now that the law provided that the employer of labour should give the man an hour for voting. Take the city of Three Rivers, for instance, which is a city of about 20,000 or 22,000 inhabitants. They give the men an hour extra at noon to vote, and the result is there is such a congestion at the polling booths that the men cannot vote,

because it is not only the workingmen who are trying to vote, but business men who are going up to lunch will stop at the polling booths also. I have seen cases where a good many men could not vote within the hour allowed them by the employers because there was too much congestion. It is well to open the poll early in the morning in order to give the railway men and the commercial travellers a chance to vote, but if we are to choose between the two classes, the workingmen and the railway men or travellers, I would take the workingmen, because they are more numerous. I do not suppose there would be more than one commercial traveller in 100 or 200 votes. More will suffer proportionately if you close the poll at five o'clock in the evening than if you open it late in the morning. If you open the poll early and close it late, it may be said that it would be too hard on the deputy returning officers, or on the clerks; but I do not think that is a very serious matter. If you open the poll at six o'clock in the morning and close it at seven or eight o'clock in the evening, you would give the labouring man the advantage of being able to vote if he could not do it during the hour granted him by his employer for that purpose.

Mr. DEVLIN: I support what has been said by the hon. member for Three Rivers (Mr. Bureau). The third largest city in the province of Quebec, the city of Hull, is in the riding I have the honour to represent.

Mr. BUREAU: Hull is fourth; Three Rivers is third.

Mr. DEVLIN: I am sorry I must disagree with my hon. friend. He has told us that the population of Three Rivers is about 22,000. Statistics show that Hull has a population of 25,000. I simply make this statement to set my hon. friend right. The population of the city of Hull is practically entirely of the labouring class.

Mr. NESBITT: What about the saloons?

Mr. DEVLIN: We have some of the greatest industries in Canada located there.

Some hon. MEMBERS: Hear, hear.

Mr. DEVLIN: I am surprised to see so many hon. gentlemen on the other side have become quite familiar with Hull only recently. They will bear me out in saying that we have the E. B. Eddy Company, the Matthews-Laing Company, the Gilmour-Hughson Company, and several other manufacturing companies of considerable importance. The voters in the city of Hull would have really little time to vote between twelve and one o'clock. The difficulty suggested by my hon. friend from Three Rivers applies with great force to the city of Hull, and I would like to see the Secretary of State insert a clause in the Bill that manufacturers in cities of over 18,000 population shall give their employees two hours instead of one for lunch on polling day.

Mr. GLASS: The question brought to the attention of the House by my hon. friend from South Renfrew (Mr. Graham) in connection with the Franchise Act of Saskatchewan, is one which seems to me to be worthy of consideration, and I speak with some understanding of the wants of the commercial traveller, because I had the honour of being a director of the Western Ontario Commercial Travellers for some years. The inconveniences and difficulties surrounding the polling of the commercial travellers' vote are generally known in the commercial districts. The principle of having Monday as a polling day for the commercial traveller has not met with the requirements of the commercial travellers. In the city of London, and I think in the city of Toronto and some other cities, in municipal elections, they have the polling on Monday invariably, but this has not resulted in polling a large commercial travellers' vote. A great many of these commercial travellers are out for two or three weeks at a time. I agree with the idea suggested by the hon. member for South Renfrew, that it might be practicable to get this class of men if arrangements could be made for taking the commercial travellers' vote on the Thursday, Friday and Saturday preceding the day of election. Because, if an election comes on Thursday and you arrange to open the poll on Monday, Tuesday and Wednesday, the advantage to the commercial traveller is practically nil, for the reason that he goes out on Monday and will be out for the whole week, and cannot, without great expense to his firm and inconvenience to himself and his business, arrange to get in and poll his vote. This question is not a new one. It has been before the House in connection with the different Election Acts which have been passed.

Mr. BUREAU: Do I understand my hon. friend to say that Friday is a better day than Monday for the commercial travellers to poll their votes?

Mr. GLASS: No, my hon. friend did not understand me correctly. I say at certain

hours on Thursday, Friday and Saturday previous to the election. In the great majority of cases commercial men are at home from Friday night to Monday morning. Some of them are at home on Thursday. I do not mean to keep the poll open the whole time, but if it were open for, say, three hours at the end of the week it would meet the requirements, whereas if it were open on Monday, Tuesday and Wednesday during the week and the election was held on Thursday, it would not meet the requirements because the men would be out on the road. My hon. friend has also said that if special consideration is to be given to any vote it ought to be given to the labour vote because that is the larger vote.

Mr. BUREAU: I said that if something had to be sacrificed it should be sacrificed to the more numerous element.

Mr. GLASS: I agree with my hon friend that the labour vote is a larger vote and that it ought to have facilities extended to it by giving workingmen a certain time to vote during the day. We had this question up in 1914 and it was discussed fully then. I brought to the attention of the House at that time the fact that there were employers whose political prejudices were so strong that they put obstacles in the way of their men going out to vote. They would say: Of course, you have the right to go and vote; if you want to exercise the right that is given to you by the law, do it, but you will understand what the consequences will be. I believe that there should be hours arranged for the workingmen to go and vote. The Bill should specifically provide that there should be two or two and a half hours in the day when every employee of a factory should have the right to vote or, if necessary, there should be alternative hours during which some of the employees, if all could not go at one time, should be allowed to go and vote. The Act should not make it permissive, but it should be made obligatory on the part of the employer to permit his employees to poll their votes without reference to the political prejudices of the employer.

Mr. L. A. LAPOINTE: I move that the word "five" in the second line of section 136 of the Dominion Elections Act be struck out and that the word "eight" be inserted in lieu thereof. I want to emphasize the fact that paragraph 3 of section 36 of this Bill makes it imperative for the returning officer to provide that the number of votes to be taken in a polling subdivision shall be not more than 300 and not less than 200. Paragraph 3 of clause 36, page 4, reads as follows.

(3) Where a polling division in a province has more than three hundred qualified voters according to the voters' list as compiled pursuant to section 46 and posted pursuant to section 48 of this Act, the returning officer shall provide separate and additional polling stations near to one another, according to the total number of qualified voters on such list, for the polling of the votes in such polling division, and so that not more than three hundred, and, when practicable, not less than two hundred qualified voters' names shall be on the list for each polling station.

It is impossible in our city to register such a large number of votes at one polling station. There has frequently been complaint about the time it takes to poll the vote. People assemble at the door of the polling station, they cannot get in and they go away disgusted. Suppose that an enumerator should send ten or fifteen women whose names are not on the list to a polling station to vote; the time occupied by the challenges and the controversies between the agents would make it impossible to register the vote at that polling subdivision during the time that the poll remained open. You will really have to extend the time from six in the morning for the railway people to eight in the evening for the labour people. I think the labour people ought to be given a chance to vote. This measure has been studied in the city of Montreal. Montreal people asked that the polls should be open from nine o'clock until eight and it has worked very well. It takes considerable time to register 200 or 300 votes. If there are many challenges they consume a lot of time. As far as the commercial travellers are concerned, it was due to them that Monday was fixed as election day. A resolution was passed by their association, with the result that in Montreal no election takes place on any day except Monday. The commercial travellers generally come back to the city for the week-end, and if the election is held on Monday they have an opportunity to vote before they leave to resume their business on the road.

Mr. VERVILLE: I do not object to having the polls open at six in the morning for the accommodation of the railway men, but I think this matter can be dealt with in another way. The labour men have been asking that election day shall be declared to be a legal holiday. If we had a legal holiday on the day that the general election is held it would obviate the necessity of

making provision to meet a great many of the suggestions which have been brought before the committee to-night. While the polls will have to be opened at six in the morning for the railway men, it would not be necessary with reference to any other business, because the men would be in a position to cast their votes at any time in the day and they would not need to have the polls kept open any later than five o'clock. My hon. friend says there are two hours which the men could utilize to cast their votes. I know by experience that many employers will say to their employees: You may go and vote if you like, but we are very busy to-day. They allow them to go and vote between twelve and two o'clock, which does not really give them two hours, but one hour. It is impossible to provide for the case of every person, but there are the stationary and electrical engineers, who would find it impossible to cast their votes unless the polls were opened early in the morning. They could not take two hours because they are running the machinery that keeps all industry in motion. The labour men have time and again asked that election day be made a legal holiday. I am sure the country would not suffer if it were declared in the Bill that the day on which a general election—not a bye-election—is held shall be a legal holiday.

Even the business men would find it an advantage to have a legal holiday, and they would be free to look after the election. My hon. friend may say that we are going to compel the labour men to lose a day. I believe the labour men are willing to lose a day provided we have a legal holiday on election day. We may find some employers generous enough to pay the men for their day. I should like to see those employers after the election; and if we find any we will erect a statue to them. I believe this will be the best system for everybody.

Mr. EDWARDS: I cannot see the necessity for the change advocated, nor do I see the wisdom of it. Railway men and commercial travellers are provided for by opening the poll earlier in certain places. The labouring men are provided for because, instead of the poll opening as formerly at nine o'clock and closing at five, it now opens at six o'clock. There is three straight hours. Then they have another hour given them by statute in addition to their lunch hour at noon. From 200 to 300 men vote at each polling subdivision in cities, and with the poll opening three hours earlier and with the hour given by statute in addition to the lunch hour, there should be no congestion in the polling places at any time. It will be found in practice that a considerable portion of the labouring men will vote between six and seven in the morning. We have had no such extension of time as my hon. friend now wants at previous elections, and the necessity for it has not been shown by any demand from members on either side of this House.

10 p.m.

Mr. L. A. LAPOINTE: The hon. member points out that we have not had these extensions of time in the past. But to-day we have an opportunity of amending the statute. Ten years' experience has shown that it is necessary to extend the hours of polling during the day. Quebec as a province has done that, and the cities of Qubec have amended their charters extending the hours of polling until eight o'clock, and in some places nine o'clock.

It is not every day that the Dominion Government has an opportunity of amending the Elections Act. I think that the time for the closing of the poll should be extended to 8 o'clock.

Mr. MEIGHEN: It would not be in the general interest to extend past 5 o'clock the time during which the poll should remain open. The hours fixed in the Election Act are not of our fixing; they have hitherto been from 9 to 5, a period of only eight hours. We add three hours in those places where there is need of the additional time; that is a very substantial extension indeed. If the additional time is added at the end of the day, it does not meet the case of any who are not accommodated by adding the time at the beginning of the day, because the labourer can vote at the beginning just as well as at the end. Moreover, it does away entirely with the opportunity of the traveller and of various classes of railroad labourers to vote. The additional time at the beginning of the day makes more valuable to the labourer the hour that he is entitled to receive from his employer under section 136A, because the poll will not be so crowded during that hour. In the first place, a number of labourers will have voted between six o'clock and seven or between six o'clock and nine, and, in the next place, a large number of those who would otherwise crowd the poll with him at the noon hour will also have voted. The great rush to get the vote out is immediately upon the opening of the poll. Each party struggles with the other to get the bulk of the vote to the poll early so that as much time

as possible may be allowed for the straggling vote.

Mr. NESBITT: That is the doubtful vote.

Mr. MEIGHEN: I hope that even the doubtful vote will be a minimum in this election. However, a large proportion of the vote will be polled in cities between six o'clock and nine; consequently, the statutory hour to which the labourer is entitled will be of far more value to him because he is going to be able to vote at that time.

Mr. L. A. LAPOINTE: What about those who commence work at seven o'clock in the morning?

Mr. MEIGHEN: Of such persons, those who are able to do so will vote between 6 o'clock and 7. It is true that some may live a long distance away and may not be able to do that. But they have an extra hour at noon, and that hour will not be so crowded as it was on previous occasions, because large numbers of those who formerly came at that hour will have voted early in the morning. This election will be held, perhaps not in the dead of winter, but at all events when the days are short; and if the time for the closing of the poll is extended from 5 o'clock to 8 there will be a good deal of polling after dark. I do not think that hon. gentlemen on either side of the House want the polls to be open between 6 o'clock and 8 in the winter or in any month that is not near the middle of summer.

As to the suggestion of the member for Maisonneuve (Mr. Verville); I remember its being discussed in the House at length some years ago. There is a good deal to be said in favour of it. In fact, there is more to be said in favour of a holiday on election day than on some other days when holidays are now given. It would seem to me, however, that there are objections to that course. The excitement that prevails on election day would be intensified a good deal if the whole day were made a holiday. At any rate, the subject is one that is worthy of consideration; so is the suggestion of the member for South Renfrew (Mr. Graham). I do not think, however, that either suggestion can be adopted in a Bill that we are going to get though this session. As to the proposal of the member for South Renfrew, the Saskatchewan enactments were sent to me and I have gone thoroughly into them. He is quite right in saying that it has heretofore been impossible for a large number of travellers and railway men to vote and that hardship has resulted. It is true that the difficulty has been met in Saskatchewan, but in that province there are only two divisional points, whereas in the whole of the Dominion there are 45. To deal with the question in respect of the whole Dominion would necessitate the opening of booths in these 45 divisional points, at which this class of the population could vote for some five hundred candidates, in 234 Dominion constituencies. The hon. gentlemen will see that tremendous complications would creep in; no matter how perfectly the plan might be worked out, tremendous difficulties in its execution would be involved and great expense incurred. Perhaps the day will come when the difficulty will be met. I think that in the meantime we have met the greater difficulties—and they will be still more substantially met if the election is held on Monday. I am not in a position to say definitely that it will be held on Monday, but if the election is held in the middle of the week we lose a good deal of the advantage of this new section. So far as I can see now, there is no insuperable objection to holding the election on Monday, and that will be done if possible.

Mr. GLASS: In what section is permission given to employees to have an hour off for the purpose of voting?

Mr. MEIGHEN: 136A. I will read the section:

> Every employer shall on polling day give to every voter in his employ at least one additional hour for voting other than the noon hour and shall make no deduction in the pay of such employees nor impose or exact any penalty from any employee by reason of absence during such hour.
>
> 2. This section shall apply to railway companies and to the government railways and their employees, with the exception of employees engaged in the running of trains and to whom such time cannot be given without interfering with the manning of the trains.

Mr. GLASS: Would it be possible to arrange that a portion of the day be set apart as a holiday for that purpose? I have observed cases where the authority of employers has been exercised viciously and in a partisan spirit as against their employees who dared to vote. In large cities a man has to vote where he lives, and sometimes his place of occupation is several miles from the place where he must go to vote. Two hours does not give him enough time to get his dinner and go to the place of polling to register his vote.

As to the suggestion that election day be a whole day's holiday, I do not think that is desirable because we have found, in certain cities of Ontario in which New Year's day has been set aside for a municipal election, it has been to the disadvantage of getting out the vote. The shrinkage has been all the way from twenty-five to forty per cent of the total vote polled. Might it not be arranged to give the last quarter of the day in addition to the hours which the voter might be allowed to avail himself of at the opening of the polls? If it is a ten-hour day, we might give him the last two and a half hours, and make the last quarter of polling day a legal holiday and let every man off for that time.

Mr. MEIGHEN: I do not know that I can add anything to what I said with regard to that subject just a few moments ago. For this reason, I think it would be obvious to the hon. gentleman that the question of establishing a new statutory holiday could not be disposed of with that consideration that should be given to it, if we are going to get through this evening.

Mr. BUREAU: This is a War-time Elections Act, and we can do things in war-time that we cannot do at other times.

Mr. MEIGHEN: This question does not pertain to a war-time election any more than it does to any other election. It had just the same application to the election of six years ago as it has to this one. I wish to refer to an amendment which I moved some time ago, which is purely a formal amendment. I am not sure whether it has been carried or not. I am sure it is the desire of hon. gentlemen that it be carried because it is of the most technical character. It is to substitute the words "the opening of the poll," for the words, "nine o'clock in the morning."

The CHAIRMAN: It is carried.

Mr. MEIGHEN: I beg to move this amendment, which is of exactly the same character:

That paragraph (g) of section 1 of the Bill be amended by striking out the word "and" from the sixth line of subsection 4, of section 37, which is provided thereby.

It is on page 3, line 25, the second word.

Mr. NESBITT: "And such."

Mr. MEIGHEN: The word "and" should go out. It is a clerical error.

Amendment agreed to.

[Mr. Glass.]

Mr. NESBITT: Did the Solicitor General consider the question I asked him about before recess?

Mr. MEIGHEN: Yes, we are doing that. I move:

That section 1 be amended by striking out the bracket which appears after the word "Council" on line thirty-three of page nine of the Bill, the comma which appears after the word "behalf" on line thirty-nine of the same page, and the comma which appears after the word "advertisement" on the first line of page ten.

Amendment agreed to.

Mr. MEIGHEN: I move:

That paragraph (i) of section 1 of the Bill be amended by striking out the letter "F" at the end thereof, and inserting instead the letter "W."

The section says that wherever a woman's name appears on the list the letter "F" shall be placed after it. We substitute the letter "W" for the letter "F" for this reason, that the letter "F" in Ontario has hitherto been used to denote the word "freeholder."

Mr. NESBITT: Under the new list it does not, but you are using the old list.

Mr. BUREAU: In Quebec the letter "F" would be all right, meaning femme. The letter "W" in French means nothing.

Mr. MEIGHEN: The letter "F" would be all right, but the letter "W" cannot be confused with any other significance, and there would be confusion in Ontario if we were to use the letter "F."

Amendment agreed to.

Mr. MEIGHEN: I move:

That section 1, paragraph (r) of the Bill be amended by striking out of the twenty-sixth line of paragraph (3) of section 65A the word "three" and inserting instead the word "four."

That is in response to the request of the hon. member for North Oxford (Mr. Nesbitt). He asked that it be five days, but after considering the matter we have decided the utmost we can allow is four.

Amendment agreed to.

Mr. MEIGHEN: I move to amend paragraph (d) of section 1 of the Bill by adding at the end thereof the following:

But excluding persons who have deserted from or have been otherwise than honourably discharged from any of such forces, or in the case of an officer excluding persons other than those who have been permitted to resign, or who without fault on their part have had their services dispensed with.

Mr. BUREAU: Why not use the words "military elector?"

Mr. MEIGHEN: It goes too far.

Mr. BUREAU: It goes too far in only one instance. The only objection to using the word would be that a military elector is an elector in camp or barracks or somewhere else in Canada. But the Act now before the House qualifies that, and deals with "persons serving without Canada." I think the word "military elector" would cover the whole ground and make for uniformity.

Mr. MEIGHEN: I first of all asked that the words "military elector" be used, but it is too wide as it is. Even if it were not, if you used the words you would have to put in the whole definition.

Mr. BUREAU: You could refer to the definition in the Military Voters' Act, subject to modification by the present law.

Mr. MEIGHEN: One could do that if this were an ordinary Act, but this is an Act which is going to be sent round to returning and deputy returning officers and enumerators, who will not have a Military Voters' Act with them. Consequently, it would be of no use for us to say "as defined by the Military Voters' Act." I think the amendment meets the case entirely, and will be better understood by those using the Act.

Mr. BUREAU: I think it would be in the interests of uniformity if we used the words in the Military Voters' Act of 1917 after deleting the words that would conflict with this Bill. Not many words besides the word "Indian" would have to come out. I do not know whether the wife of an Indian serving at the front would have a vote.

Mr. MEIGHEN: We will let the amendment stand for the moment. I beg to move:

That section 1 be amended by inserting at the end of paragraph (p), section 1 of the Bill, the words "and by further amending said Form P by inserting between the words 'being' and 'an' in the second line of the second paragraph thereof—

This is the form which gives information for electors, and which reads as follows:

Every male person shall be qualified to vote at the election of a member under this Act, who, not being an Indian, is a British subject and of the full age of twenty-one years—

And so on. To conform with the present Act it will have to read this way:

Who, not being a person affected by the provisions of section 67 of the Dominion Elections Act, nor being an Indian, is a British subject.

That is to say, every man who, not being an Indian, is a British subject of the full age of twenty-one years, and is not disqualified by the provisions of section 67, which gives the disqualification of voters. I will read the whole amendment:

That section 1 of the Bill be amended by inserting at the end of paragraph (p) of section 1 of the Bill the words "and by further amending said Form P by inserting between the words 'being' and 'an' in the second line of the second paragraph thereof the words 'a person affected by the provisions of section 67 of the Dominion Elections Act nor,'" and by striking out the word "two" from the third line of the third paragraph of said Form P and substituting therefor the word "five."

Amendment agreed to.

Mr. MEIGHEN: I move that section 1 of the Bill be amended by adding thereto, as paragraph (s)--this is at the end of section 1 of the Bill—

Mr. A. K. MACLEAN: That refers to form X 1 of the Act?

Mr. MEIGHEN: Yes. Form X 1 is obviously inapplicable to the present law, so it is struck out—by inserting within the form EE between the lines respectively reading "rejected" and "not used and returned" the words "polled in envelopes."

And also in form FF, between the words "were" and "rejected" in the third line from the end, the words "polled in envelopes."

This is simply to make the form correspond with the Bill. There are now ballots polled in envelopes, and they must be treated as other election papers, consequently they are included in these forms.

Amendments agreed to.

Mr. MEIGHEN: I move to amend section 1 of the Bill by adding thereto, as paragraph (t), the following:

(t) By inserting between the words "make" and "three" in the fifth line of section 46, the words "at least."

Previously, the enumerator had to make three copies of this list. Now he will have to make at least three copies in order to provide one for each of the candidates. I also move to amend section 1 of the Bill by striking out the words "the other" from the second last line of section 48 as provided by paragraph (j) of said section, and inserting instead the words "another," and by adding at the end of subsection 1 of the said new section 48 the words "he shall on the same day deliver or send by registered mail to each of the candidates a

copy of such list." That is to say, fifteen days before election day, he must send a copy of the list by registered mail to each of the candidates. The other words have to be changed accordingly; so that he will have to make a sufficient number of lists to do that.

Mr. NESBITT: Does that apply also to page 9 for the cities and towns?

Mr. MEIGHEN: It applies everywhere.

Mr. NESBITT: What he has to do is separated for the cities and towns.

Mr. MEIGHEN: It is a clause that applied everywhere before, consequently when we are amending it it applies everywhere still.

Mr. NESBITT: I will read the part with reference to the cities and towns:

—nine thousand or over according to the last Dominion census shall complete, date at his place of residence, and sign the copies of the voters' lists fifteen days before the polling day; two of the said copies he shall forthwith post up as required by section 48 of this Act, and the third he shall personally deliver or mail by registered letter to the chairman of the voters' registration board constituted by the Ontario Franchise Act, 1917, for the city or town.

According to that, he is supposed to strike off three copies, two to be posted up, and one sent to the chairman of the registration board.

Mr. MEIGHEN: I see the point now. The enumerator is done with it once he makes the list; then they go to the voters' registration board. There is no use of the enumerator sending one of these lists to the candidate at all because they are not complete. They are revised by the voters' registration board.

Mr. NESBITT: We have no way of getting a copy except by going to where they are posted up and making a copy of them.

Mr. MEIGHEN: That applies to both sides, of course.

Mr. NESBITT: It would be no trouble to the enumerator to send a copy to the candidate when he strikes off three; just as they do in the country.

Mr. MEIGHEN: My opinion is we have amended the clause to the extent that it would mean he would send his list, so far as completed, to each of the candidates.

Mr. NESBITT: They are supposed to be completed by the enumerator, and the reason why we have four days for checking them is to correct any error there may be. It would be a very awkward thing to send somebody up to the board where they are posted, to take a copy of them.

Mr. MEIGHEN: If there is any doubt about it, I will have an amendment prepared so that the enumerator will send a copy to each of the candidates.

Mr. BUREAU: Will the Secretary of State now take paragraph 33A? I have no objection to his amendment if he will add four words to it. As it is now, it says:

Every female person shall be capable of voting and qualified to vote at a Dominion election in any province or in the Yukon Territory who, being a British subject, and qualified as to age, race, and residence, as required in the case of a male person in such province, or in the Yukon Territory, as the case may be, is the wife, widow, mother, sister or daughter of any person, male or female, living or dead, who is serving or who has served without Canada—

The amendment comes on the word "person," that is, on the person on whose account this right to vote is given, but it does not say so. If the Secretary of State will add the words "but excluding the wife, widow, mother, sister or daughter of any persons who have deserted from, or who have been otherwise than honourably discharged from any of such forces." That would cover the ground.

Mr. NICKLE: If the committee will direct their attention to line 30 it will be observed that the word "person," to which reference is made, is used there for the last time and therefore the language following must refer to that word "person" and no other.

Mr. BUREAU: My hon. friend from Kingston (Mr. Nickle) cannot have been in the House this afternoon when I suggested that the word "person" qualifying the right of female relatives to vote might refer to any man who, under this Act, would not have the right to vote. It was brought to my mind by the fact that this dynamiter, who is being chased around, is a returned soldier, and yet under this Act his wife, mother or sister could have the right to vote. If you put another subsection in, you start something new and you exclude the man who has not been honourably discharged. These things are provided for by the Military Voters' Act. The section which we are considering has reference only to the female relatives of these men. There will be ambiguity unless you do what I suggest.

Mr. NICKLE: My hon. friend desires that the wife, widow, mother, sister or

daughter of a deserter be not entitled to vote?

Mr. BUREAU: Not a deserter, but a man who has not been honourably discharged.

Mr. NICKLE: Not honourably discharged. Let us read the section:

> Every female person shall be capable of voting and qualified to vote at a Dominion election in any province or in the Yukon Territory, who, being a British subject and qualified as to age, race and residence as required in the case of a male person in such province or in the Yukon Territory, as the case may be, is the wife, widow, mother, sister or daughter of any person, * * * * but excluding the wife, widow, mother, sister or daughter of any persons who have deserted from or have been otherwise than honourably discharged from any of such forces.

That can only refer to a member of the forces because the wife, mother, sister, or daughter cannot be discharged from the forces. The only person that can be discharged is a member of the forces, and therefore the reference excluding the relatives of a person means relatives of a soldier who has not been honourably discharged from the forces. I do not see any other meaning that can be taken out of the amendment.

Mr. BUREAU: It may be that my knowledge of the English language is defective, but when I translated this provision into French I found that it led to ambiguity. If you adopt my amendment there is no possibility of ambiguity. We will use the French version of the statute in our province. I do not see any harm in making this change. If it makes it more lucid I do not see why you should refuse to adopt it.

Mr. MEIGHEN: We will return to that in a few minutes.

Mr. PUGSLEY: I think the view which my hon. friend has in mind would be achieved if we put at the end of the clause "excluding the relatives of persons who have deserted."

Mr. MEIGHEN: The difficulty would be that the relatives of persons who had deserted might have other persons at the front who had not deserted. What we are doing is to exclude deserters from the operation of the section altogether.

Mr. BUREAU: A woman might have one relative who had deserted and another who had not. That would be a hard case, but you cannot make a law that would meet every case.

Mr. MEIGHEN: You can meet that case.

Mr. BUREAU: My hon. friend wants to exclude a deserter and in that I am with him, but I say that the place to exclude a deserter is in the Military Voters' Act.

Mr. MEIGHEN: We are not on that Act.

Mr. BUREAU: You are giving the franchise to women in a clause that relates to women only. Under that clause the widow, wife, sister, or mother of the Canadian who has gone overseas to fight will have the right to vote. I am not opposed to disfranchising the deserter, but let that stand aside for the time being, because you will have to amend the rest of the law if you are going to do that. This particular suggestion I made came to my mind because the case of this man Monette. I happen to know something about the relatives of this man, and I asked myself: Why should these women, who, I am sorry to say, are not deserving of having the vote, even if Monette did go to the front, be given the right of the ballot while the wife of my neighbour, who has been working night and day knitting socks and collecting subscriptions for the Red Cross and the Patriotic Fund should be denied that right? If the theory of the Solicitor General is right, that we should emphasize the right of the man who has gone to the front to express himself at the polls, and I think it is, it must be remembered that this Bill does not deal with the right of any soldier to vote. It says that the female relatives of any person who has gone to the front shall have the right to vote. My hon. friend says that a deserter, or an officer who had not been properly discharged, would be excluded. But they should be dealt with in the Military Voters' Act. Let us put another section into this Act so that there will be absolutely no ambiguity as to the right of women who are the relatives of soldiers to vote.

Mr. MEIGHEN: We can return to the section in a moment. In the meantime I wish to move the amendment that I promised the hon. junior member for Halifax (Mr. A. K. Maclean) and the hon. member for Carleton (Mr. Carvell). I move that paragraph (d) of section 1 be amended by adding thereto the following as subsection 2 of 33A:

> Such naval forces of Canada shall be deemed not to include members thereof engaged within Canada who may become members after the passing of this Act.

Amendment agree to.

Mr. MEIGHEN: I move also that section 1 be amended by striking out of the second line of section 131 the word "seven" and inserting instead the word "twenty-eight". That is merely to have that section conform to the change in the law making twenty-eight days between election day and nomination day.

Amendment agreed to.

Mr. MEIGHEN: I beg also to move an amendment to paragraph (d) by adding at the end thereof:

But excluding persons who have deserted from or have been otherwise than honourably discharged from such forces.

Mr. PUGSLEY: What I suggested, and what I think my hon. friend from Three Rivers (Mr. Bureau) would approve of was: "this section shall not be deemed to include such relatives of men who have deserted or not been honourably discharged."

Mr. MEIGHEN: But they might be relatives of more than one soldier.

Mr. PUGSLEY: If a woman was the relative of two soldiers, one of whom had deserted and the other was at the front, she would still be entitled to vote by virtue of the man who was serving.

Mr. MEIGHEN: No, because she gets no right except by this section.

Mr. EDWARDS: Why not put in the words "sole right"?

Amendment agreed to.

Mr. A. K. MACLEAN: Subsection 2 of section 1 of the first Bill begins with the following words:

Subject to the provisions of section 5A of this Act, in the compilation of such lists,—

And so on. This Act will be in the hands of many men not accustomed to reading or construing statutes and this section may be confusing. I find that many of my friends on this side have understood this to apply to all the provinces, whereas it is intended to apply only to British Columbia, Alberta, Saskatchewan, Manitoba and Prince Edward Island. Enumerators reading this may take it as applying to all the provinces. I would suggest the insertion of the words "in the provinces of British Columbia, Alberta, Saskatchewan, Manitoba and Prince Edward Island." This would remove any chance of confusion.

Mr. MEIGHEN: It applies all over with respect to women. While an enumerator or deputy returning officer getting only this Act or the old Act might have great difficulty in understanding all of it, as it applies to different provinces in various ways, the Clerk of the Crown in Chancery is compelled by the law to issue definite and clear instructions to enumerators and returning officers in every province telling them just what does apply to his province. This will all be made clear by instructions from the Clerk of the Crown in Chancery.

11 p.m.

Mr. A. K. MACLEAN: I do not quite agree, and I see no objection to my suggestion by reason of the fact that women must be placed on the list. The same words are used in several sections, section 48 and section 62. The marginal reference to section 62 is "application for certificate as a qualified voter by person whose name is not on list." The sense of that section is that outside of the provinces of Quebec, Ontario, Nova Scotia or New Brunswick, a person claiming the right to vote and not finding his name on the list may apply to the enumerator to have his name entered.

Clearly that could not be done so far as Quebec, Ontario, New Brunswick and Nova Scotia are concerned. It would be made quite clear, I think, by striking out the first and second lines and inserting the words "in the province of British Columbia"—then mentioning all the other provinces.

Mr. MEIGHEN: It would be clearer if it would be right. In my opinion it would not be right, because the section operates not merely in those provinces, but all over the Dominion; in certain provinces it operates subject to certain limitations. The briefest way of putting it, therefore, is as it is here. I am sure that it will be clearly explained in the instructions issued by the Clerk of the Crown in Chancery.

Mr. PUGSLEY: I did not come in early in the evening because I knew that it was utterly impossible to discuss this Bill under closure. The rule is that no member shall speak more than once while closure is in force. Has that rule been rescinded?

The CHAIRMAN: The committee agreed by consent not to follow the letter of the rule. If an hon. gentleman calls my attention to the fact that the rule is not being observed and raises objection, the rule will have to be followed.

Mr. PUGSLEY: Do you intend to apply the rule at two o'clock in the morning? Shall all these important amendments be adopted without further discussion?

The CHAIRMAN: If the hon. member for St. John asks me to apply the rule, I certainly will do so.

Mr. PUGSLEY: I do insist upon the rule being either rescinded or strictly applied.

Mr. MEIGHEN: The rule was rescinded by general consent. Certain hon. gentlemen opposite asked if they might put questions and receive answers the same as before, and that was agreed to. If the hon. gentleman desires that the rule shall be observed it will have to be observed.

Mr. PUGSLEY: The minister comes here to-night with amendment after amendment which he recognizes as being absolutely necessary to perfect the Bill. It is utterly impossible to discuss this Bill under closure. Amendments have been submitted which alter the Bill, in some cases materially, in other cases not so materially. I understand that at 2 o'clock in the morning closure will be applied. Surely the Bill should not be reported from the committee with these important amendments before it is reprinted for the information of hon. gentlemen. I call the attention of the Secretary of State to the unfairness of dealing with the matter in this way. Does he think that this is an occasion upon which closure should be enforced? Every disposition has been shown to facilitate the passage of the Bill; there has not been the slightest attempt to delay it.

Mr. MEIGHEN: It is quite true that we have been getting on excellently; I hope that we shall so continue. The amendments that have been made, while necessary, do not, in the main, involve discussion. One or two—we have discussed them —simply make the Bill comply with the fundamental principles of the proposed legislation. There is no reason why they should not come in on the last day of the discussion; I have never heard that no amendments should be offered on the last day in committee. There is no question about discussing them. We can discuss them, I freely admit, much better under the ordinary rule in committee, and we have unanimously agreed to do that. But we cannot do it except by unanimous agreement, and I am willing that we should apply the rule rigidly if the Committee so desires.

Mr. PUGSLEY: Does the minister intend that the closure shall apply at two o'clock in the morning without the Bill being reprinted with the amendments?

Mr. MEIGHEN: Hon. gentlemen who have been here know that the amendments are all right. They will be reprinted as soon as they are decided upon by the committee.

Mr. PUGSLEY: Before the Bill leaves the committee stage?

Mr. MEIGHEN: No, the Bill has to go out of committee at this sitting. There is not the least question about printing these amendments. If there were, that would mean that on the last day of the committee no amendments could be submitted.

Mr. PUGSLEY: A great many of these amendments have been made upon the suggestion of the minister himself, and it is grossly unfair to ask the committee to consider them with the closure resolution passed this afternoon staring us in the face. The minister says we cannot consider these amendments after two o'clock. But the minister himself since I came in has occupied three-quarters of the time of the committee in making the necessary explanations—explanations which he has made with great clearness and with much satisfaction to the committee. What I protest against is that this important Bill should be considered and amended in many different respects under closure procedure.

Mr. BUREAU: Are you going to apply the closure rules, Mr. Chairman?

Mr. MEIGHEN: No.

Mr. NESBITT: Let us go on as we are.

Mr. BUREAU: I asked the Solicitor General before six o'clock if it would be possible to provide in the law that the enumerator should have a residence qualification. Of course, I would prefer that the qualification in Quebec should remain as it is. Every time the lists are made up names can be added by either candidate. The secretary-treasurer does this in our provincial elections. But the Solicitor General does not want to amend the law along that line; it is not such an amendment as he would desire to insert at this time. As I remember the wording of the Bill it says "the Governor in Council may appoint." That means that he will appoint.

Mr. MEIGHEN: This has always been the form. But the Governor in Council has never appointed them.

Mr. BUREAU: That may be, but, as I said this afternoon, this is a thing that is absolutely new to us. We have never had enumerators, and we have never dealt with

them. I would suggest that the enumerators should live in the municipality and, if it were possible, that the secretary-treasurer of the municipality should be the enumerator. I think that would be the fairer way because the secretary-treasurer is a man that has some responsibility. He holds his position through the good-will of every inhabitant of the municipality. Perhaps the word "municipality" may seem strange to or scare some of my hon. friends opposite. I understand that in some provinces municipality means the whole county.

Mr. HAZEN: That is the case in New Brunswick.

Mr. BUREAU: In Quebec a municipality that has three polling divisions is a very large one. By the word "parish" we mean all the worshippers that belong to a church, and, for administrative purposes, the municipal boundaries are all the same, so that there is in our province a closer kind of affinity between the people in a municipality on account of our institutions than there is in the other provinces, out West, for instance. The secretary-treasurer, as I said this afternoon, is thoroughly acquainted with, not only every man and woman in his municipality, but every child. He is at the same time the secretary-treasurer of the school board for the district. I would ask the Solicitor General—this would not take much of an amendment—to insert in the Bill that in Quebec the secretary-treasurer of the municipality shall be the enumerator. The absolute and complete knowledge that he has of his muicipality will make it easier for him to take care of three polls than if you take a man who is not accustomed to going through the assessment rolls and the rolls of the children at school. With men who are accustomed to the work, you would need three men, if each one has to attend to only one poll. The secretary-treasurer is usually a man of education. He is generally a notary. Sometimes, of course, his duties do not involve much work, because the valuation is only revised. As has been stated by some hon. gentleman opposite, the changes in a municipality, especially in an old one, are just the deaths and births, and when the electoral list is revised those who have gone are stricken out and the young men who have reached the age of twenty-one years are added. I make a last appeal to the Solicitor General, not in the way of embarrassing him, nor of delaying the Bill, but in the way of helping along the execution of this law, and of helping along the enfranchisement of the people whom the Bill desires to reach and the disfranchisement of those whom the Bill wishes to disfranchise. The secretary-treasurer knows better than any one else when a man of alien enemy nationality came to the municipality and whether he is naturalized or not. The municipalities are so small, the people are so close together, and their relations, I might say, so intimate, that the secretary-treasurers know the family history of any one perfectly well. Should the Solicitor General decide that he cannot grant that, I would ask him to add after the words "the Governor in Council" the words "may, in the province of Quebec, appoint an assessor residing within the municipality for which he has to act, or in the neighbouring municipality." We do not want to impose upon other provinces what we think right in Quebec.

Mr. MEIGHEN: That is just the difficulty that has arisen several times. You cannot make any rule on that point that would be applicable everywhere, and still every province is just in the same position, so far as the real substance of the case is concerned, as Quebec. I do not see any formidable objection really to appointing an enumerator from the municipality, nor even from the neighbouring municipality, and I venture to predict that every one will be appointed out from municipality and not even the neighbouring one. One might get a case in which the right man was just across the road, in which the man everybody would want was the town clerk, perhaps, and could not reside in the municipality. He might reside outside. There would be no gain by my hon. friend's amendment. The great chance is that every one who will be selected will reside in the municipality because he must reside in the polling division to know his work, to be qualified to do it. I do not like the idea of selecting an individual man and saying to him: You must do this work. That is not the spirit of this Bill. The man, as soon as he is sworn to act, is then bound to act, but it would hardly be right to put the hand of the law on every secretary-treasurer in Quebec, who may, in some cases, be engaged pretty steadily in his own work and may have other engagements and occupations besides, and say to him: No matter how busy you are; no matter whether your present time is occupied from morning until night, no matter what sacrifice it may be for you, for the sake of $30

or $40 you have to travel through your municipality and enumerate the women in it.

Mr. BUREAU: The secretary treasurers under the provincial law do the work that would correspond to your enumeration. They are making up the lists now. On the 15th those lists have to be posted. I am not afraid of the enumerators, but the people in the municipality are not accustomed to that line of conduct to be followed in order to be registered as electors, and they would be at a loss to know where to go. They would not understand this new method of procedure, and I am satisfied that it would not work so easily for the women you want to reach, or the men you want to exclude, as the system I suggest. As far as the work is concerned, I can assure the Solicitor General that none of the secretary-treasurers in any of the rural municipalities will refuse on account of being overworked. I am satisfied they will accept the position.

Mr. NESBITT: The Solicitor General could comply with my hon. friend's request so far as having the enumerators appointed in the polling division is concerned, because it is a custom in Ontario to appoint the deputy returning officer out of the division, and it would be a matter of common practice to appoint enumerators from the division because there would be no difficulty about getting them. I have no doubt that practice would be followed, and there would be in the division plenty of people perfectly willing to act. If in compiling these lists, say in Ontario, we have to add only certain names and strike off certain names, would the enumerators be likely to go around from house to house to get those names, or would he be subject to the candidates supplying him with names that ought to be added on or taken off?

Mr. MEIGHEN: It would be his duty to employ both methods, namely, to go from house to house and to accept names from the candidate after investigating each one.

Mr. NESBITT: Or from others?

Mr. MEIGHEN: Yes. While I am on my feet, I will move the amendment which meets the former request from the hon. member for North Oxford (Mr. Nesbitt). I move to amend paragraph (r) of section 1 by striking out from the eighth line of sub-section 3 of section 65 A, provided by said paragraph, the words, "and the," and inserting instead the word "(a)," and by further amending said sub-section by adding after the word "town" in the twelfth line thereof, the words "and he shall deliver or mail by registered letter a copy of such list to each of the candidates."

While I am on my feet permit me to correct a slight error that I think I made yesterday in referring to the province of Ontario. It is not all the cities and towns over nine thousand that are in the special list of those for whom made-up lists are not now being used, but only county or district towns over nine thousand.

Mr. OLIVER: Is the amendment my hon. friend has just read confined to Ontario?

Mr. MEIGHEN: That one is, but a previous one did the very same thing for the rest of Canada.

Mr. McKENZIE: The greatest objection I have in connection with these enumerators is the great uncertainty as to when and where they shall meet. Section 45 of the old law says:

> In the Yukon Territory each enumerator forthwith after taking the said oath, shall post up in six of the most public places within each polling division for which he has been appointed enumerator, a notice that he has been appointed enumerator for the polling division, and that he will proceed forthwith to compile, and within thirty days will complete the voters' list for the polling division, and designating the office or place within one of such polling divisions where he may in the meantime be found, and the hours during which he will attend at such office or place for the purpose of compiling such list on each lawful day, which shall begin not later than ten o'clock in the forenoon and end not earlier than four o'clock in the afternoon each day.
>
> 2. In such notice the time and place during and at which the final revision of the lists for which provision is hereinafter made will take place, shall be designated.

That is the law for the Yukon. If something along this line were done for the province of Nova Scotia, so that we would know when and where these men were to begin work, I should be satisfied.

Mr. MEIGHEN: There has always been a corresponding section to this for Alberta and Saskatchewan, and that section is now applicable to all the provinces of Canada.

Mr. McKENZIE: Which section is it?

Mr. MEIGHEN: I cannot give it just now, but it is further amended by providing for the posting up of the lists for a longer period during which the enumerator sits to revise the lists, and for a longer period between the time of revision and election day.

Mr. PUGSLEY: The posting is required to be done in only two places. That is a very limited notice.

Mr. MEIGHEN: That is the way the posting is always done in those provinces. In addition to that we are compelling the enumerator to send a separate list by registered mail to each candidate in each constituency on the very day he posts up the lists. The candidates get a list, and they can make copies if they want to.

Mr. PUGSLEY: I think two is a very small number.

Mr. MEIGHEN: It must be remembered that in the rural parts they have no way of typewriting the list, but there is nothing to hinder the candidates from making a copy.

Mr. MURPHY: A copy will be sent to the candidates fifteen days before polling?

Mr. MEIGHEN: Yes. I wish to move in amendment to section 2:

That section 136 of the present Bill, subsection (b) of section 2, be amended by adding the names of the following cities: Stratford, St. Thomas, Saskatoon, Moosejaw, Kingston, Brockville and Hull.

Mr. NESBITT: Would my hon. friend object to adding Woodstock also?

Mr. MEIGHEN: I do not think there is any objection to adding any place so long as the member for the constituency is sure that the convenience is going to be greater than the inconvenience.

Mr. NESBITT: It does not make a great deal of difference.

Mr. PUGSLEY: My hon. friend from Westmorland (Mr. Copp) is not in his seat at the moment, but I imagine he would like to have Moncton added to the list. It is a great railway centre and, I think it would be desirable to have the polls open an hour earlier there.

Mr. MEIGHEN: We will add Moncton.

Mr. GRAHAM: I think Brockville is a city for the purposes of the provincial Act.

Sir ROBERT BORDEN: Naming it as a city makes it a city for the purposes of this Act.

Mr. ROSS: In the case of a tied ballot, on a recount the judge decides whether the voter who has been refused a certificate by the enumerator had the right to vote in a certain polling division. It might happen that the tied voter might not have the right to vote in a certain polling division on account of not being a resident there, but he might have the right to vote in the electoral district.

Mr. MEIGHEN: If that were permitted and if a man wanted to vote in some more convenient place than where he had the right to vote, all he would have to do would be to force his vote through and the judge would have to count it. We do not want to enable a man to vote out of his division.

Mr. OLIVER: I want to ask one or two questions which are not actually in line with the subjects which have been under discussion this evening, but perhaps I might get attention. What is the position of Doukhobors who have left the community and have taken up residence as ordinary citizens? Are they free from the prohibition of the Act, or are they still under the terms of the Act?

Mr. MEIGHEN: In my opinion, they are free from the prohibition of the Act.

Mr. OLIVER: Could that ruling or that view be expressed in any way for the information and guidance of the enumerators?

Mr. MEIGHEN: Yes, it could be, by the instructions which, the Act provides, shall be sent out by the Clerk of the Crown in Chancery. The disfranchisement provisions of this Act are intended to cover only Doukhobors and Mennonites who are included in the exemptions under the Military Service Act, and not other Doukhobors and Mennonites or other classes who are not conscientious objectors, so that the Doukhobors and Mennonites who are not members of the community, if they do not come in as conscientious objectors, would not be subject to this Act. There is no difficulty in making that clear by instructions issued by the Clerk of the Crown in Chancery. Of course, I realize I should be very careful about giving my opinion to the House on matters of law. I simply give this as my opinion as a lawyer. Personally, I have not the least doubt about it.

Mr. OLIVER: I am not as familiar with the situation in regard to the Mennonites, but I rather fancy it is somewhat similar. There are Mennonites who, although they call themselves Mennonites, do not hold to the original non-combatant principles of the sect. I should think similar action would be desirable in their case.

Mr. MEIGHEN: I think so, too.

Mr. OLIVER: I understand that a man of alien enemy descent is debarred from voting, no matter in what country he was born.

Mr. MEIGHEN: Not unless his natural language is an alien enemy language.

Mr. OLIVER: My hon. friend is aware that there are large numbers of people of German descent, born in the United States, who are now residents of Canada.

Mr. MEIGHEN: They are not affected by this Act at all. Any born in the United States, no matter what language they speak, are not affected by the Act.

Mr. OLIVER: The word "European" is used?

Mr. MEIGHEN: Yes. I wish to move that the cities of Charlottetown and Belleville be added to the list I moved in my last amendment.

Mr. L. A. LAPOINTE: Has the question of the secrecy of the vote been very carefully considered, according to article 62?

Mr. MEIGHEN: Yes.

Mr. L. A. LAPOINTE: Suppose the enumerator gave a certificate to a woman, entitling her to vote at a certain polling station. The deputy returning officer takes the vote, and he is obliged, according to the law, to record the name of that woman in a book. Now, suppose only one woman votes and that vote has to be put in an envelope, where is the secrecy?

Mr. GRAHAM: She will tell anyway.

Mr. MEIGHEN: I am afraid in that case my hon. friend is right. If there was only one woman in the poll, and her vote had to be enveloped, and it came before a recount judge, I am afraid the public would know for whom she voted, if the judge decided she had the right to vote. If he did not so decide, the public would not know.

Mr. NICKLE: If the committee will turn to section 32 of the Bill distributed to-day, they will see it reads as follows:

> 32. The qualifications necessary to enable any male person to vote at a Dominion election in any province shall, except as by this Act otherwise provided, be those established by the laws of that province as necessary to entitle such male person to vote in the same part of the province at a provincial election.

Section 33A says that the qualification of a woman shall be the same as to age, race, and residence as that of a man. In the ordinary lists prepared in past elections, the provincial qualification and the provincial machinery were available, and the lists were prepared pursuant to provincial legislation. In all the provinces, I think, to be a voter a person must be a British subject and twenty-one years of age. As this Act is altogether independent of the electoral machinery of the provinces, the electoral machinery of the provinces will never begin to work, therefore there is no data on which one can determine how long a person must have residence in the province or in the municipality to be entitled to vote. For the sake of illustration, take the province of Ontario.

At the last session of the Ontario legislature a change was made in the conditions under which a man might be placed upon the voters' lists. Prior to that if he was entitled to vote at a municipal, and not at a legislative election, he would be put on the list provided that he had been in the province for nine months prior to the assessor beginning his duties or twelve months prior to the revision of the list by the judge. If, on the other hand, he was a manhood suffrage voter, he would be put on the legislative list if he had been one year in Canada and three months in the municipality. These provisions will, however, under this Act, never come into effect as the provincial legislative machinery in Ontario intended to apply to the province will not be effective, and therefore in order to make provision for residence and domicile qualification it is necessary that there should be an amendment to this Act. I, therefore, beg to move:

> That section 1, paragraph (c), be amended by adding as subsection 2 and 3 of section 32 the following:
>
> "2. Except in the province of Quebec and notwithstanding anything in this Act contained, in preparing or adding to the voters' lists provided for by this Act, the qualifications as to residence, and domicile of electors shall in any province where there is no relevant or applicable provision to the contrary be residence for one year in Canada and residence and domicile in the electoral district for thirty days, both of said periods to be fixed by reference to the date of the writ of election.

The purpose of the amendment is that in any province outside of Quebec the elector must have resided in Canada for one year and in the electoral district for thirty days prior to the date of the writ of election being issued.

Mr. GRAHAM: That would be applicable to women voting in Ontario?

Mr. NICKLE: To a very great extent. It would apply also to cities and county towns where the population is over 9,000. In Quebec there has to be a variation for the reason that their law has no qualification as to residence in Canada or residence within the electoral district. All that is

necessary is that the elector shall at the time of the preparation of the lists be domiciled in the electoral district. Therefore the second amendment reads as follows:

3. In the province of Quebec notwithstanding anything in this Act contained the qualification as to domicile shall be domicile at the date of the said writ of election.

A person must be domiciled in Quebec at the time the enumerator makes his rounds.

Mr. McCREA: I notice that there are certain towns and cities to be put on the list where the voting will commence at six o'clock in the morning. These are manufacturing and railway points. Sherbrooke is a manufacturing and railroad centre, and I think it would be well to put it on the list of places where the poll will be open at six o'clock.

Mr. MEIGHEN: I will have it added to the clause.

The CHAIRMAN (Mr. Rainville): Is it the pleasure of the committee that Sherbrooke shall be added?

Some hon. MEMBERS: Carried.

Mr. PUGSLEY: It strikes me that the amendments proposed by the hon. member for Kingston (Mr. Nickle) are so very important in their character that they should not be pressed to-night. Take that affecting the province of Quebec for instance; there are very few members from Quebec here to-night. The leader of the Opposition is absent. It is intended to depart in some way from the provincial lists. If it is not intended this amendment would not be moved by my hon. friend. He is moving it because he is taking some position different from that which is in the Quebec law. Section 32 provides that:

32. The qualifications necessary to enable any male person to vote at a Dominion election in any province shall, except as by this Act otherwise provided, be those established by the laws of that province as necessary to entitle such male person to vote in the same part of the province at a provincial election.

Why is it necessary at this late hour for the hon. member to propose an amendment to alter the principle laid down by the Solicitor General that the provincial law as to the voters' lists should apply? If this makes any change it is of a most important character. If it does not make a change, if it simply carries out the provincial law, there is no necessity for it. I would ask my hon. friend whether he thinks an amendment of that character should be pressed without giving an opportunity to members from the province of Quebec to discuss it. I do not quite understand what the other amendment with reference to the rest of the Dominion means.

Sir ROBERT BORDEN: The object of these provisions is merely to cover possible cases of omission. As has been explained by my hon. friend from Kingston (Mr. Nickle), on account of certain legislation passed by the legislature of Ontario at the last session, the provisions fixing the period of residence would not be applicable in the case of lists which are to be made up in cities and towns. Therefore, this provision seems necessary. As far as Quebec is concerned, it is not intended to affect the provincial law but is simply to carry it out. In Quebec, the qualification is domicile at the time the list is being made, but as the provincial law may not apply to the lists made under this Act the same principle is established here; that is domicile at the time the list is made up.

Mr. PUGSLEY: No, this is changed apparently. The domicile in Quebec is of the date of the writ of the election.

Sir ROBERT BORDEN: That is when the list is made up.

Mr. NESBITT: As I understand the amendment, this would apply to women who are to be added in the townships and towns in Ontario, and also in the towns of over 9,000 where registration takes place.

Mr. NICKLE: Yes.

Mr. NESBITT: So far as Ontario is concerned, I agree that it is a necessary amendment.

Mr. PUGSLEY: Why not limit it to Ontario? There is no difficulty in the other provinces because there is the qualification. In New Brunswick one qualification is as to residence or ownership of property. If the provincial lists are to be followed, there is no necessity to make any change. Why not make the amendment apply simply to the province of Ontario?

Sir ROBERT BORDEN: I do not think that would be wise. The necessity of the amendment arose by reason of attention being called to the peculiar condition of the legislation of Ontario. Argument might be made that there was no relevant provision in Ontario. We cannot be sure that some similar condition does not prevail in other provinces. This section has no application except in the case where there is no relative and applic-

able legislation in the province. If there is relevant legislation, in any province, that prevails. If for any reason it appears that legislation in the province is not in force for this particular purpose, then this Act has application, but not otherwise.

Mr. MARCILE: I do not think there is necessity for this amendment in our province, as a man has no right to be put on the list unless he is domiciled in the district.

Sir ROBERT BORDEN: This amendment has been prepared by the Minister of Justice, whom we consulted, and who said, as my hon. friend has said, that the legislation of Quebec requires that there shall be domicile at the time when the list is in preparation; but that provision of the provincial law may not have application to a list which would be made up under this Act, and therefore, in order to carry out the absolute and necessary intent of the provincial law, this amendment is proposed which declares that domicile at the time the list is made up, that is at the date of the writ of election, shall be the controlling qualification.

Mr. MARCILE: But if a man from the province of Quebec leaves the province and is away for a year he has no more right to vote, by the law.

Sir ROBERT BORDEN: This does not change that.

Mr. MARCILE: We are at present making our lists in Quebec. They will be deposited by the 15th. Complaints may then be made until the 30th of September, after which time the council of every municipality has fifteen days to revise the list. A man to be on our list must be domiciled in a polling district.

12 m.

Sir ROBERT BORDEN: The Act does not touch lists as already established in Quebec except as they are to be changed by the addition of women voters and by the disqualification of voters of enemy nationality. In fixing domicile for the women voters it is necessary to have this provision which is established upon the same basis as that which ordinarily prevails in the province of Quebec in the preparation of the provincial lists.

Mr. GERMAN: Section 48 says that the enumerators shall post up copies. There is no appeal, so far as counties are concerned, from the enumerators. There is an appeal in cities an towns of 9,000 or over. These appeals must be in within three days, which is too short a period.

Mr. MEIGHEN: That has been changed to four days.

Mr. GERMAN: And the ten days has been changed to fifteen days. The times are all too short. When there are enumerators appointed absolutely of one political opinion, who can make up a list just to suit themselves, it is an absolutely wrong thing to tie any party down to the decision of enumerators. I should like those in charge of this measure to look at section 48. Where is the appeal? There is none, excepting to the enumerator on election day.

Mr. MEIGHEN: The enumerator's work is revised in every respect judicially. Everything he does in any province, if it is wrong, can be corrected by the opposing party before a judge.

Mr. GERMAN: After the election.

Mr. MEIGHEN: Before the election is decided. I will be quite happy in my constituency if I can be declared—

Mr. GERMAN: Yes, because the enumerator will be of your political faith and will fix the lists to suit you. That is the object of the Bill.

Mr. MEIGHEN: If the hon. gentleman believes what he says—

Mr. GERMAN: I believe absolutely what I say; and that is why the Bill is being passed.

Mr. MEIGHEN: You should have sympathy with us during all these twelve years in the provinces of Alberta and Saskatchewan. It is strange the hon. member did not look so fierce and talk so wildly in those days.

Mr. GERMAN: Because the Act was being administered honestly.

Mr. MEIGHEN: Oh, I see.

Mr. GERMAN: I would like an answer showing what provision there is for an appeal from the enumerator in counties.

Mr. MEIGHEN: First of all, the Act will be administered honestly. Next, if any enumerator makes an error intentionally or otherwise, if he puts a man off who should not be off, the other side can challenge that vote and demand that, before it be counted, a judge shall say it is right. If he refuses to put a man on who should be on, that man can defy him, demand a certificate, go to the

poll, take the oath and vote, and his vote is counted unless the judge decides it is not a proper vote. The residue that will come before the judge, it is believed, will be the smallest residue that could in justice go.

It is the only way you can get review; it is the only way you can get your lists in country districts ready in time for an election. If you have judicial review in every country district you cannot have the election within a reasonable time. We provide for having the election within a reasonable time and at the same time provide such safeguards that no enumerator can make an error without the other side having ample opportunity to correct it. I do not think it makes any difference whether the judge gives his decision before or after the election, so long as his decision is a proper one. It has the same result so far as the contest is concerned.

Mr. GERMAN: Why should you not have appeals in rural districts as well as in cities and towns?

Mr. MEIGHEN: There are not judges enough; you could not get the work done. Does the hon. gentleman know how long the work takes now in rural districts?

Mr. GERMAN: I do know very well.

Mr. MEIGHEN: In the northern parts of Ontario, for example, it takes three months.

Mr. GERMAN: You propose to leave all these questions to a recount after the election is held. It seems to me that is an absurd proposal. Why should there not be an appeal before the election. You have thirty days between nomination day and polling day. Why should not the lists be made up at least by nomination day? Surely the judge in any constituency can decide in twenty days whether or not the lists are properly made up.

Mr. MEIGHEN: In many instances he could not get around.

Mr. GERMAN: Well, give him an opportunity to get around.

Mr. MEIGHEN: Does the hon. gentleman know that in some constituencies—

Mr. GERMAN: I know as much about the constituencies as the hon. gentleman does; perhaps I know more. The proposal with regard to appeal is absurd and absolutely wrong.

Mr. OLIVER: Section 33A, page 1, provides that a woman who is the wife, widow, mother, sister or daughter of any person, male or female, living or dead, who is serving or has served without Canada in any of the military forces, shall be entitled to vote. Is it not desirable that there should be a direction to the enumerator that he should take knowledge of the name and identity of the soldier in regard to whom a woman claims the right to vote? If the name of the soldier in whose name a woman claims the right to vote is placed on the enumeration list along with her name, there would be no question, in case of challenge, about her right to vote.

Mr. MEIGHEN: That would encumber the list quite a little, but if it produced any substantial results. there would be a compensation. I do not think, however, that it would produce any substantial results. If the vote is challenged, all these details must come before the judge in any case. It is a question whether the judge's duty would be in any way lightened or anything would be made any more definite before the judge by the presence of the name of the soldier after her name on the list.

Mr. OLIVER: If there is no direction to the enumerator all he is required to do is to ask the women: Are you entitled to vote? Have you a brother, son or other relative at the front? She says: yes, and he puts her name down, he is not required to pursue the question of identity. If there was a direction that he must pursue the question of identity, it might save troublesome proceedings later on and tend to the securing of a better and more definite list.

Mr. MEIGHEN: I am inclined to think that the hon. member is right. It would be better to have the instructions to the enumerator include the duty on his part of keeping a record of the name of the soldier.

Mr. MURPHY: Could not my hon. friend go further than that and devise some method of establishing the identity of the person claiming relationship?

Mr. MEIGHEN: Every person's identity is put beyond doubt on the list. The directions would be to get the name of the soldier.

Mr. MURPHY: As this discussion goes on I recall from time to time the evidence given before the Returned Soldiers Committee. I have in mind a statement made by the Chairman, who was also Chairman of the Patriotic Fund, that in any number of cases two or three women claimed to be the wife of one man.

Mr. MEIGHEN: The identity of the women is to be established by every possible means. Her name goes on the list; she has a number; her occupation and address are given. I do not think there is any way of more clearly fixing her identity.

Mr. MURPHY: Surely some proof ought to be required.

Mr. PUGSLEY: The Prime Minister says that the amendment which has been moved by the member for Kingston (Mr. Nickle) was prepared by the Minister of Justice. To whom should its authorship be attributed?

Mr. NICKLE: This amendment arose merely out of my desire to do a kindly thing to the hon. member for Carleton (Mr. Carvell), who was intensely bitter before recess because there was no provision preventing men who had been out of New Brunswick for nine years, and who had gone to the United States, from voting. This was done in order to try to prevent the evil of which he complained.

Mr. PUGSLEY: That may be correct as to other provinces, but I am speaking now of Quebec. I cannot understand this provision:

> In the province of Quebec, notwithstanding anything in this Act contained, the qualification as to domicile shall be domicile on the date of the said writ of election.

The Prime Minister, in answer to the hon. member for Bagot (Mr. Marcile), said that this would apply only to the new voters, but it does not only apply to them; it is general; it would apply to all. The result of this would be, it seems to me, that a voter whose name was on the list and who changed his domicile, perhaps a month before the date of the said writ of election, would be disqualified, and as he would not be on any other list, he would lose his vote altogether. I dislike intruding myself in any matter relating to another province, but the matter has to be dealt with as this is an important amendment and it is so late in the discussion. If the minister would change this to read—

> In the province of Quebec, notwithstanding anything in this Act contained, the qualification of the female voters to be added under this Act as to domicile shall be domicile on the date of the said writ of election.

I would see no objection, but in the form proposed by the minister it might disqualify a large number of people who would find themselves challenged at the polls because they had changed their domicile, and as they would not be on any other list would thereby lose their vote altogether.

Mr. MEIGHEN: If I understood the Prime Minister correctly, the proposed form would not be objectionable, but I would like to consult either the Prime Minister or the Minister of Justice before definitely accepting that amendment.

Mr. E. LAPOINTE: I was not in the House when the amendment was moved, and I did not hear the explanation of the Prime Minister, but it seems to me that it really applies to all the voters, because section 32 applies to any male person qualified to vote at a Dominion election. This amendment would, therefore, apply to all voters already on the ist of Quebec. There is certainly no reason whatever for this amendment.

Mr. NICKLE: If hon. gentlemen will refer to section 65 A on page 8 of the original Bill, they will see that there is nothing in their contention. The Minister of Justice, who drew this sub-section—of course, I do not understand the law in Quebec—explained it to me. He said that in Quebec, the qualification of the elector is determined by his domicile as of the date on which the lists are deposited with a certain official who has charge of the lists—I do not know just what his title is.

Mr. BUREAU: The clerk of the municipality and the town clerk of the city.

Mr. NICKLE: That applies to the male voters in Quebec, those who are entitled to vote at a parliamentary election. But the lists on which the female voters in Quebec will vote will never be deposited with any official because the provisions of the Quebec law do not make that possible, and therefore, there must be some date determining domicile. As the list in reference to the male voter would be prepared so that the provisions of sub-section of 65 A would not apply, it was not necessary to say anything further on that point of the argument, and this sub-section 3, as I understand it, will apply only to the female voters. Whether or not there is any objection to putting in the word "female," I do not know what the Minister of Justice will say. This subsection 3 was put in with a view to only affecting women voters added under this measure.

Mr. MARCILE: If it applies only to female voters, let us say that, and then there will be no objection.

Mr. PUGSLEY: This section says that in the preparation of and the adding to the

lists, the qualification shall be domicile on the day of election. I can understand why, in respect to new voters you should make that provision, but the difficulty is in the interpretation of it. A man who had changed his domicile prior to the date of the writ could be challenged and his name would be struck off, and as he would not be on any other list, he would lose his vote. That is what I am afraid would be the result of this amendment.

Mr. BUREAU: Section 65A begins with the words, "Notwithstanding anything in this part of this Act." This amendment says again: "Notwithstanding anything in this Act." That bars section 65A, and the question of domicile will be settled as from the date of the issue of the writ. I did not read the section very closely, but it would be better if you struck out the words, "Notwithstanding anything in this Act contained," and just say, "In the province of Quebec, the qualification as to domicile shall be domicile on the date of the said writ of election." Do the words, "Notwithstanding anything in this Act contained" refer to the whole Act or to subsection 65A?

Sir ROBERT BORDEN: They have general application. The object of the section prepared by the Minister of Justice is to preserve, in relation to additions which are to be made to this list, the same principle which is enacted by the law of Quebec with regard to the preparation of the ordinary lists of that province. In the ordinary lists, qualification as to residence is settled by the domicile at the time the lists are made up. This amendment is designed to maintain that principle in respect to additions made of women voters to this list. That is the sole purpose of it. It was thought necessary by the Minister of Justice, who can explain it much more fully that I can as he is more familiar with the laws of the province of Quebec than I can claim to be.

Mr. PUGSLEY: When my right hon. friend was out I raised this point. The amendment says:

> In the province of Quebec, notwithstanding anything in this Act contained, the qualification as to domicile shall be domicile on the date of the said writ of election.

You see, it is general in its application; it does not apply simply to the female voters who are added.

Sir ROBERT BORDEN: Some amendment is proposed as to that.

Mr. PUGSLEY: Probably that will cover it.

[Mr Pugsley.]

Mr. E. LAPOINTE: Section 32 applies only to male voters; it says:

> The qualifications necessary to enable any male person to vote at a Dominion election in any province shall, except as by this Act otherwise provided, be those established by the laws of that province as necessary to entitle such male person to vote in the same part of the province at a provincial election.

And to that section 32, which applies only to male voters, it is proposed to add a subsection 3, reading:

> In the province of Quebec, notwithstanding anything in this Act contained the qualifications as to domicile shall be domicile on the date of the said writ of election.

This subsection is added to a section which deals with male voters only. This is certainly likely to create confusion.

Mr. MEIGHEN: This is a section that I thought could be delegated while I was attending to others, and I have not followed it from the beginning. I have listened to the argument pretty carefully, and I hope it will be found that the words can be inserted. My idea is that they can be.

Mr. PUGSLEY: The amendment should be to section 33 instead of section 32.

Mr. DOHERTY: As to the purpose of the amendment itself, before we discuss where it ought to be put, as the Prime Minister has explained with regard to these female voters to be added to the lists, the date of domicile must correspond with the ordinary law of the province. By section 180 of the Quebec Election Act it is provided that,

> The following persons, and no others, being males, and who, at the time of the deposit of the list under articles 196 and 197, or 222 and 223—

I may say that this provision is for Montreal and the divisions outside of Montreal.

> —as the case may be, are domiciled within the limits of the municipality in the electoral district for which the list is made.

With regard to the ordinary lists there is no requirement as to period of residence in the constituency. You are entitled to be on the list, so far as domicile is concerned, if you were domiciled in the constituency at the time the list was deposited with the secretary treasurer, or with the City Clerk. With regard to these women who are to be put on the lists, they only get put on the lists when this enumeration takes place, and absolutely the same principle is applied. If you are domiciled in the constituency at the time

the list is being made, that is the constituency you belong to, and on the list for that constituency you are entitled to be put. We have fixed on the date of the issue of the writ of election, because that is the time when these additions to the original list are taking place.

Mr. LEMIEUX: Why not specify "female voters"?

Mr. DOHERTY: I have not the slightest objection to adding these words. The amendment will then read:

In the province of Quebec notwithstanding anything in this Act contained, the qualification as to domicile of female voters shall be domicile on the date of the said writ of election.

The advantage of putting the amendment where it is proposed is that you are dealing at the same time with the question of qualification depending upon residence or domicile.

Mr. L. A. LAPOINTE: I should like the Solicitor General to consider Form Y on page 97 of this little yellow book, where the voter is required to swear that he has not been disfranchised under the provisions of the Disfranchising Act, or for corrupt practices under the Dominion Elections Act. This oath is very often put to the elector by the candidate's agents. Will the same formula be adopted under the new law? In a big city like Montreal, electors are constantly moving in and out and the lists have to be revised every two years. My hon. friend the Minister of Justice knows how difficult it is to locate one's electors. One man, one vote, is the formula we apply, but suppose a man has moved from one constituency to another and his name has not yet been crossed off the old list at the time of the election—and here are hundreds of cases of this kind—would this man be disqualified?

Mr. DOHERTY: There is nothing said in the form as to the place where the voter resides who is asked to swear that he is not disqualified? Is my hon. friend's suggestion that because of a man's change of residence he might not feel justified in swearing that he was not disqualified?

Mr. L. A. LAPOINTE: Yes.

Mr. DOHERTY: Of course this is the form that has been in use for years. As regards all masculine voters in the province of Quebec, the existing lists will stand just as they are to-day. There is no requirement made of residence anywhere in the present Bill that will alter in any way the qualification of a male voter in so far as residence is concerned. The male voter who comes under the category of persons born in alien enemy country may be struck off the list, but save in that regard, and save that female voters may be added, the list we have under the existing law is the list upon which this election shall be held, and any man who is on the list in a particular constituency is still perfectly qualified notwithstanding his having moved. I do not see why any difficulty should arise when he swears he is not disqualified. He is qualified because he is on the list for that electoral constituency, whether he has moved out or not.

Mr. L. A. LAPOINTE: If we swear him he might object to the wording of it. If the question be put to him "have you been disfranchised under the Franchise Act"? he may say "I do not know what that means."

Mr. MEIGHEN: We have not changed that in the slightest. That is the form which has been always there.

Mr. L. A. LAPOINTE. But to-day it is one man one vote, and the elector votes where he resides.

Mr. MEIGHEN: The disfranchising law is just the same as it was before; the Corrupt Practices Act is just the same; so the oath means just the same.

I wish to move, that the words "so help you God" in paragraph (q) of section 1, form Z, be added at the end of the form. This should have been in the Act, but was omitted.

Amendment agreed to.

Mr. MEIGHEN: I move the adoption of one amendment which was not carried as we went along, that is in regard to paragraph 33A.

Mr. LEMIEUX: Is that the female voters, Quebec?

Mr. MEIGHEN: There are certain restrictions suggested by the hon. member for Halifax (Mr. A. K. Maclean) and the hon. member for Carleton (Mr. Carvell).

I think my hon. friend does well to wait until we are pretty weary before asking that this section be adopted, because every man who is at all awake and alert must see there is the strongest possible objection to the section in its present form. I find it provides that the relatives of any person who is serving within Canada in any of the naval forces shall be entitled to vote.

Mr. MEIGHEN: We have amended that.

Mr. PUGSLEY: My hon. friend recognizes the utter absurdity of the provision, and amends it so that it will not apply to any man who enlists after the passage of this Act. After the Act passes, I suppose there will be four weeks before the election, and of course you can see the absurdity of allowing it to apply to relatives of persons who may join the naval forces after the election.

Mr. MEIGHEN: The hon. member for Carleton assured us if we accepted the amendment he would accept us as sincere. I hope you will not repudiate that.

Mr. PUGSLEY: I am sure the Secretary of State misunderstood the hon. member for Carleton.

Mr. MEIGHEN: That is what he said.

Mr. PUGSLEY: I do not believe anything the minister could do in the way of slight amendments of this character would convince the hon. member for Carleton of the sincerity of this Government in submitting this Bill to Parliament. I would ask my hon. friends on this side of the House if they heard the hon. member for Carleton say he would be satisfied as to the sincerity of the Government. There is no corroboration of that statement. The amendment is a slight concession to the demand for not violating all the rules that ought to govern in connection with the giving of votes to the relatives of the soldiers. The Secretary of State has spoken of the Bill as based upon a principle, which appeals very strongly to every man—that those who have gone to the front occupy a unique position. He says they have either made or are ready to make the supreme sacrifice for the country; that many have died upon the battlefield; and that it is only right that their relatives might be supposed in a certain measure to be able to speak for them, and it is but proper their relatives should be given the right to vote. He based it upon the grounds of service and of sacrifice.

Yet he allows the relatives of, I presume, hundreds of men who have joined vessels engaged in the fishery service to vote—vessels which now are part of the naval forces of Canada, and also men on cruisers, cooks, engineers, and others who had been employed on these vessels for years before the war broke out, who never thought of going abroad, who are engaged upon vessels that could not sail or steam across the Atlantic, and who, when they joined, knew that their services would be entirely in Canada. These men are simply doing the work that they were employed to do years ago and their engagement involves no liability to cross the ocean, to go to the front or to incur the risk or make the sacrifices which men who have gone to the front are called upon to make. The relatives of these officers and men, seamen, midshipmen, cooks, engineers and deck hands, are, by this Act, to have the right to vote. I do not know what argument has been presented in favour of doing this, but it cannot be justified upon any of those grounds which the Secretary of State and the Prime Minister have so eloquently put forward as the reason for giving the votes to relatives of those who have gone overseas. In the case of the soldier, of the man who enlists, but who has not left Canada, who has volunteered for the service of his country and is ready to cross the ocean and risk his life on the battlefield, this privilege is not extended to his relatives. It is only when he goes overseas that his relatives shall be entitled to vote. Yet, that principle is departed from in regard to men who are engaged upon these vessels which constitute a part of the Canadian naval service. Why should that be so? Why should the relatives of a man who has enlisted in the expeditionary forces of Canada as an infantryman, an artilleryman, or as the member of a forestry battalion, and who has signified his willingness to go to the front and risk his life, be debarred from the right to vote because he is still in Canada, while you give the right to the relatives of the men who are engaged upon these vessels, who have not gone out of Canada, who never intend to go and who know that they will not have to go?

Mr. MEIGHEN: The hon. gentleman is quite wrong. A man who joins the naval service has to go wherever he is sent, whether overseas or elsewhere. When the hon. gentleman says that these men never volunteered to go overseas he is wrong.

Mr. PUGSLEY: They never expect to go.

Mr. MEIGHEN: The figures given to-day show that some 3,000 have gone. With regard to the rest of the hon. gentleman's address, I have answered it so often that I think he would consider me a bore if I answered it again.

Mr. PUGSLEY: The minister has not answered. The minister says that they have volunteered to go overseas. So did the infantrymen and the artillerymen volunteer to go overseas.

Mr. MEIGHEN: That is quite true.

Mr. PUGSLEY: They have all volunteered to go overseas. But there are a great many small vessels forming the naval forces in Canada—is that not so? Are not the fishery cruisers a part of the naval forces of Canada?

Mr. MEIGHEN: The naval forces were defined clearly this afternoon by the Minister of Marine and Fisheries.

Mr. PUGSLEY: They would include the men I spoke of. It cannot be that because they have volunteered and are liable to be sent overseas the right is given to their relatives and refused to men who have volunteered in the military forces of Canada to go overseas. They are compelled by the oath which they take to go beyond the seas, and they volunteered for that purpose. Why should their relatives be refused the vote while the relatives of the men who are serving on board these vessels, who are still in Canada and many of whom have never been outside of Canada except perhaps for a few miles along the coast, be given the vote? I am not able to see the reason.

Mr. MEIGHEN: If the hon. gentleman desires the relatives of the soldiers in Canada to be included it can very easily be done by simply striking out the words "without Canada." If the hon. gentleman cares to move that amendment we will give it immediate consideration.

Mr. PUGSLEY: That is not what I am at. The Government limit the right of the female relatives of soldiers to the relatives of those men beyond the seas. That is the principle of the Bill. I take it that, for good and sufficient reasons as they appear to the Government, they do that as a matter of principle because their view is that if men are still in Canada they will be able to vote and there will not be the same difficulty about it as there may be in the case of the soldiers at the front. I hope that difficulty will not occur in very many cases. I trust that all the soldiers will have an opportunity of casting their ballots and determining how the affairs of this country will be administered during the next five years, and whether the mismanagement, corruption, partisanship and waste of public money shall be continued during the next five years or not. Now the Government refuse the privilege to female relatives of the members of the expeditionary forces who have not left Canada.

But with respect to those in the naval forces, the relatives of those who have served either within or without Canada are given the vote. My hon. friend may have explained the reasons for this distinction very fully and satisfactorily. He certainly did not do so when I had the good fortune to be present; and I should be delighted, and I am sure the country would be, if the minister could give any satisfactory explanation for this distinction. I cannot conceive of any. We have still an hour before the guillotine will fall, and I invite the minister to explain this discrimination. He invites me to suggest amendments. We have been considering this Bill hour after hour, a Bill which, when it was presented to this committee, gave evidence of as careless drafting—perhaps not careless but of as hasty drafting—as any Bill ever presented to this House. When the Bill was introduced it was incomplete, it was interlined, it was not completely printed, and it was in such form that it could not be printed in French until the very day of the second reading. This Bill, drafted and introduced in imperfect form, was not distributed in French and English until after the calling of the second reading, owing to the haste of its preparation. To-day the minister has presented amendment after amendment, all under the rules of closure which, if they had been applied, would have absolutely prevented any discussion of these amendments or of the Bill. I would ask the minister during the remaining hour to explain the discrimination in 33 A between the female relatives of those who have joined the expeditionary force and are still in Canada training to go overseas to fight for their country, and the relatives of those who are members of the naval force who are still in Canada and will be at the time of the election.

Mr. MEIGHEN: It is quite true that there is an hour yet before the closure comes into effect, and I know that the hon. member is troubled as to keeping up the discussion for that time. We are all good-natured on this side, and do not at all mind his occupying—

Mr. PUGSLEY: I can assure you that we feel very ill-natured on this side. This is one of the greatest outrages ever perpetrated.

Mr. MEIGHEN: I would rather the hon. member would not ask me to repeat myself to help him out in occupying this hour. I have explained every point that he has brought up. We have no particular objection to enfranchising the relatives of soldiers in Canada if hon. gentlemen opposite desire them to have the franchise. But

there is a difference between them and those who are overseas. There would be an opportunity for fraudulent enlistment for male fide or not bona fide enlistment. There has been some of that in Canada, not a great deal.

Mr. PUGSLEY: That is the way you would get recruits.

Mr. MEIGHEN: Recruits that are not bona fide are not much good if they afterwards leave. I accepted the suggestion of the hon. member for Carleton (Mr. Carvell) with reference to the patrol service in Canada. Those in Canada as
1 a.m. yet are not subject in any degree to the perils of war. Those enlisted in the naval forces are, although some of them are not in as great danger as others; many of the overseas forces, construction and forestry battalions, are in the same position, although the peril there is very substantial indeed. It is very substantial in the naval force too.

Mr. A. K. MACLEAN: Are the vessels engaged originally in the fishery service now within the naval service?

Mr. MEIGHEN: I shall ask the minister.

Mr. CURRIE: What is the sense of asking that? Every man who enlists for service in this war takes the oath for the war and becomes a soldier or sailor for the war.

Mr. A. K. MACLEAN: What has that to do with it?

Mr. CURRIE: Just to create trouble the hon. member desires to send for the minister to give that information.

Mr. A. K. MACLEAN: My hon. friend does not understand my statement. I want to know if the ships that are actually engaged in the fishery service, by the statute become part of the Canadian navy. There are on the Great Lakes a number of vessels engaged in the fisheries service; does my hon. friend say they are performing war service?

Mr. CURRIE: The man who enlists in the naval service, is sworn in and put on the regular patrol is performing war service. By no stretch of the imagination could the hon. gentleman look upon these men as not belonging to the navy.

Mr. A. K. MACLEAN: Suppose they do; is it right that their relatives should have the vote?

Mr. CURRIE: The question resolves itself into whether these men will vote for hon. gentlemen opposite. If they would not vote for hon. gentlemen opposite, it would be very wrong to give them the vote; that is what is disturbing the member for Halifax (Mr. A. K. Maclean). Many of those men are doing mine-sweeping service on the coast, where submarines have been active. A gentleman whom I met in the hotel last evening told me that the ship upon which he had been bound to Quebec was sent to Halifax when it reached the Banks because of the report that there might be submarines in the mouth of the St. Lawrence. The most dangerous service rendered in connection with the war is mine-sweeping,—looking after mines dropped by submarines. Thousands of young men in Scotland and England have been blown up in these trawlers. I received a letter the other day in which it was stated that a young man 22 years of age had been drowned when a trawler that he was on was blown up. Many of these ships go out, strike a mine, and are never seen again. The Germans have submarines in the Atlantic that are capable of coming to this side and of carrying large quantities of mines for distribution around the mouths of harbours. Submarines have attacked vessels off the Atlantic coast of the United States. Men engaged in the very service of which my hon. friend complains have been lost at sea. Why, then, does he desire to discriminate against them? The wives, daughters, sisters and mothers of those men are as much entitled to the right to vote as to the right to receive separation allowance. The member for St. John has talked so much this session; he has asked so many questions, that he really exhausts the frontbenchers on this side. I am sure that he must have asked millions of questions since the session commenced. The member for North Cape Breton (Mr. McKenzie) also has distinguished himself by his attacks on members on this side, particularly by his venomous attacks on the Government. When I see a man in action in this House I always visualize something that he resembles. There is a modern instrument which is employed in the building art and which is operated by means of compressed air and mud. This instrument is known as a mud-gun, and if there is one thing that the member for North Cape Breton reminds me of, it is a mud-gun. The trouble is that when he starts in he does not confine himself to operations above the belt. He indulges in all kinds of insults and insinuations, and he gets away with them because we do not want to waste the time

of the House in answering him. The volumes of Hansard he has filled this session will go down to posterity, but at the conclusion of this session I have no doubt that we shall have seen the last of him for ten years.

Mr. McKENZIE: If the member for North Simcoe (Mr. Currie) thinks that it is a soft snap to put me out of action in my county, I invite him down to North Cape Breton and Victoria. The honourable gentleman is the last man in this country, in view of the record that the ex-Minister of Militia gives him, who should talk about action.

Mr. CURRIE: Now, he is starting the mud business.

Mr. McKENZIE: If my honourable friend wants to know his record as a man in action, I may tell him that he was found up to his neck in a dugout when he should have been at the front leading his men. When he came to this country looking for promotion the then Minister of Militia refused to give him promotion, because he was not entitled to it. Afterwards the honourable gentleman stood up in this House and complained about it. For a number of months the honourable gentleman was too much ashamed of himself to mention soldiers or soldiering. Now he is getting Dutch courage; he thinks that people are forgetting his record. What right has he to turn on me at this hour of the night? I have been perfectly quiet during the last twenty-four hours. My honourable friend puts himself forward as a man whose intellect towers over that of other honourable gentlemen in this House, but he is the only person who thinks he occupies that position. So far as wasting powder on dead monkeys is concerned, I think I have put in almost enough time on my honourable friend. If he thinks that he can fling mud at me whenever he wants to, he is mistaken; he had better take to his dugout. He says that I have insulted the Government and the members of the House. I am not aware, Sir, that I have insulted any member of this House since I came into it. I do not take kindly to insults from anybody. I do not expect them; I do not take them, because I am not built along those lines, either mentally or physically. What I do not take from other people, I am not disposed to pass over to them. I am disposed to get along amicably and respectfully with every member of this House, and I shall be sorry, indeed, to have it go abroad amongst hon. members that I am insulting the Government or insulting any member of this House. If I believe the Government is wrong, or if I have any criticism, I make it in clear cut, bad Anglo-Saxon very often, because I must say to hon. gentlemen that, when I stand up here speaking English, I am not speaking my native tongue. When an hon. member from Quebec addresses the House, if he makes mistakes in his English, it is all excused because English is not his native tongue, but if a man who is a Gaelic man as I am, makes any mistake, it is attributed to stupidity on his part. I am serious when I say that English is not my native tongue. I am not, therefore, as flowery as some hon. gentlemen might be in the use of that language, but I can make myself understood, particularly when I am saying some things about hon. gentlemen who occupy the treasury benches. What I wish to say about the Bill now before the House—

Some Hon. MEMBERS: Say it in Gaelic.

Mr. McKENZIE: The hon. member for Calgary, (Mr. R. B. Bennett), who is not in the House now, broke forth the other night into some of St. Paul's injunctions and directions—

Some Hon. MEMBERS: Oh, oh.

Some Hon. MEMBERS: Say it in Gaelic.

Mr. McKENZIE: He was dealing with spiritual wickedness in high places. I am asked to speak Gaelic. I am also going to follow some of St. Paul's directions, namely, not to cast pearls before swine. To be serious for a moment—

Some Hon. MEMBERS: Say it in Gaelic.

Mr. McKENZIE: The hon. member for North Simcoe, (Mr. Currie) understands me in Gaelic well enough. I have spoken Gaelic to him before, and perhaps he thought that was a weakness in me, and that was why he turned his mud-gun on me, the only gun he can handle.

There is in our constitution a provision which recognizes civil rights as property. The right to vote is, in a sense, property. The minister is giving the enumerators power to strike men off the lists without giving them notice or an opportunity of defence. That is not right. If some day, when the minister is not very busy, he will open the first volume of the reports of the Supreme Court of Canada and read the first case reported there, he will find this doctrine of notice dealt with at length,

and the doctrine laid down that a British subject cannot legally be deprived of anything that is in the nature of property or civil rights without giving him notice that he is to be so deprived and affording him an opportunity of defending his right. I think it will be accepted by every hon. member in this House, and particularly, by the lawyers, that the right to vote is property, and that no citizen of this country, whether he was born in this country or elsewhere, once he has become a British subject, should be deprived of property or civil rights without being given notice, and an opportunity of saying to the court before whom he is called, the reason why he should not be so deprived. This enumerator does not sit publicly. The man who is deprived of his vote does not know where the enumerator is sitting. The only thing he knows is, when he goes to the poll to cast his ballot, that his name is not on the list, and he will then discover that at some place and at some time this enumerator struck his name off the list. There should, therefore, be something in this Bill a little more explicit than we have now by which it would be known to men who are likely to be struck off the list, where this official will be sitting, and that when that official goes over the list and comes across names he intends to strike off, he should serve notice on such men that on a certain day he intends to deal with the question whether or not they shall remain on the list. They can then appear before him and give such answer as they may have. Even if their reasons would not change the mind of the enumerator these men, would feel more satisfied, and it would be more along the lines of British practice if they were given notice. There is nothing in the Bill to enable the enumerator to do that. There is no provision as to where the enumerator is to come from. I have no great objection to any man in my county being appointed an enumerator, but I think it would be better that enumerators be appointed within the county. I would not care that enumerators from the western part of the province should be brought down to my county, and I am sure the people of the western portion of Nova Scotia would object to men being brought down from Cape Breton to be enumerators in the western part of the province. Provision should also be made that enumerators should be residents of good standing in the county in which they are to operate. They are appointed in a lump number by the Governor in Council. Then the returning officer distributes them to the different parts of the county. The town of Sydney Mines is divided into six or seven polling divisions. Will there be an enumerator for each of those polling divisions?

[Mr. McKenzie.]

Mr. MEIGHEN: Yes. No one is deprived of the right of the franchise although he may be deprived of the right to be on the list.

Mr. MORPHY: As there is still half an hour going begging in this debate, I hope I shall not appear to be trespassing on the time of the House if I say a few things in connection with some statements that have been made during the debate to-night, particularly by the hon. member for North Cape Breton, who has made an unwarrantable attack upon an esteemed and worthy member of this House.

Mr. McKENZIE: Who started the ball?

Mr. MORPHY: An unwarrantable attack, I say, upon a gallant soldier, Colonel Currie of the 48th Highlanders. One would have thought that a man who boasted of his Gaelic descent, and of his Scottish birthright, would have been the last to stand up in a public assembly and attack a member of the gallant 48th. There seems to be the bitterness of gall there. My immediate object in referring to the matter is to say to hon. gentlemen of this House that the attack is absolutely without foundation and entirely unworthy any hon. gentleman to make in this House against a soldier who has been under fire at the front with his men, day in and day out, at the risk of his life. A man who has shown the intrepidity that Colonel Currie has shown should not be attacked in such an unwarrantable manner on the floor of this House from personal or any other motives. I have seen not only one, but two letters from the front from men who have served under Colonel Currie. I wish I had them here, because it was with great pleasure that I read them. One was from a private in the ranks who had seen some of the attacks made against Colonel Currie in the press of this country and throughout the world, and he said that the attacks were without foundation, and that the men who have served under Colonel Currie loved him so much "they would follow him to hell." To hear a gallant officer defamed in this House in that way makes my blood boil, and I think it is only right that I should tell the House what I have learned from letters from the front.

. With regard to the general attitude of hon. gentlemen opposite, as I have listend to this debate I have been struck by one thing above all others, and that is that some hon. members opposite have shown no love for the soldier's wife, and mother, and sister and daughter. Others with a higher patriotic spirit have maintained a splendid respectful silence. This House has witnessed an attack on a soldier and his near relatives. We have witnessed a deliberate attempt in the face of public opinion in Canada to give to the wife of the slacker and the wife of the alien enemy a status equal to that of the wife of the soldier who is fighting for the Empire. I do not know why that should be. Have we descended so far in the realm of party politics that the hon. member for St. John (Mr. Pugsley) will stand up in this House and say, as he did the other night, that a party in this House will hear from the alien enemy wife and widow and sister in thunder tones? He mistakes the patriotic women of Canada. There is no more loyal woman in the world than the patriotic women of Canada, who are glad to see the soldier's wife, and daughter, and mother, and sister, who have made the greater sacrifice getting the vote. The women of Canada who have knitted socks and made comforts for the soldier have displayed a patriotic spirit right through that would have been an inspiration for the hon. member for St. John if he had felt like coming up to the high standard these women have set. These women are proud that the soldier's women relatives are being given a preference in the matter of voting.

I was very much amused at my hon. friend from North Cape Breton (Mr. McKenzie) taking the attitude he did after he had boasted so much of being Gaelic. Why, the record of Scotchmen the world over is one of chivalry and bravery; there never was a Scotchman in the days of old who would have voted against supporting the men at the front as my hon. friend did; no, not one. They have always been over the top first, the Black Watch and the Irish Enniskillens. And to hear a Scotchman who has voted against conscription, against sending succour to the boys who are fighting in France and Flanders for his liberty in this country—to hear him boasting of his Gaelic ancestry and indulging in a tirade of abuse against an officer who has seen service at the front, is a very painful thing for me to have to listen to. I do not wonder that as the clock goes on some hon. gentlemen opposite have grown tired.

I do not wonder that, though they complain of closure being applied, their heart is so little in this fight that the Chamber is almost empty. They cannot occupy the time alloted to them, and we on this side of the House who have sat silent have to get up and help them fill up the time. Their hearts have failed them in this fight; it is palpable, you can almost feel it. Some hon. gentlemen over there are good, some of them are fine; but the atmosphere is charged to-night with the weakness of the cause for which they are fighting, with the abject futility of fighting against what they know to be right.

Let me say a word or two about my own constituency. The hon. member for Humboldt (Mr. Neely) last night spoke of the German in the West who could not be allowed to enlist. Have there been two policies in the Militia Department of this country? No. The German in the West was entitled to enlist just as freely as the German in the East. In my own county—I say it with pride—forty-five boys of German descent enlisted in the 110th Battalion and went to the front and fought; some of them died, others have been wounded, and a few have returned. In the 71st Battalion there were 58 men of German descent. In the 34th Battalion 52, in the 11th Battery—

Mr. PUGSLEY: There are some members of this committee who are desirous of discussing this Bill, and I would call the hon. gentleman to order.

Mr. MORPHY: I am discussing the Bill, and if the hon. gentleman's stock of patience is as large as the vocabulary he has displayed during this debate he will see that my remarks were strictly in order. I propose to discuss this Bill, and I do not think that my hon. friend has any right to interrupt me, as he has already given up the fight.

Mr. PUGSLEY: He has not given up the fight by any means. He is going to carry the fight to the country and hon. gentlemen will hear from him. The point of order is this. The hon. gentleman has been speaking of everything but the Bill which is under consideration. He has also spoken his twenty minutes.

The CHAIRMAN: I took note of the time at which the hon. member started speaking, and I find that he has almost ten minutes to run yet.

Mr. MORPHY: In the 14th Battery there were twenty-four of German descent; in the 64th, six; and in No. 1 Canadian Army Medical Corps, nine. Altogether 203 Ger-

mans have enlisted and gone to the front from the county of Perth. One of them has won the Military Cross, and a second bar. His father happens to be a German born, and I am sorry to say that that man will be disfranchised. It is a pity, but it is true.

Mr. GRAHAM: Will not the father be enfranchised under this Act, his boy having gone to the front?

Mr. MEIGHEN: He will not be disfranchised. He was never naturalized.

Mr. MORPHY: The record those boys have made has been splendid and they have carried back a lot of French wounded soldiers. They are doing great work in every possible way. I think the hon. member for Rouville (Mr. Lemieux) will bear me out that it is paradoxical in this country, in this war, in this great crisis, that German boys of German descent, to the extent of 203 by actual count of mine over the service rolls have left to fight against the principles of the Hun, against the principles laid down by the Kaiser. We will not say very much about the county of the hon. member for Laprairie-Napierville (Mr. Lanctot); there have been only 36 altogether who have left there, and I do not know whether any of them were French or not. I think it is so paradoxical that it is worth while mentioning it on the floor of this House.

Mr. LEMIEUX: Only the day before yesterday I read in the press a very fine report about the French-Canadians at the front. Twenty-four of them were decorated on the field of battle.

Mr. MORPHY: I am glad my hon. friend speaks of it, because there is no man in Canada who takes a greater pride than I do in the brave fellows who have left the province of Quebec to help in the great fight. But why are they not supported to the fullest limit? Their bravery in leaving for France ought to compel every man who proclaims his French ancestry to come along and give those boys all the help they desire. It should not be left to the German boys of Ontario to bring back French wounded.

Mr. LEMIEUX: On the eighteenth of this month I am taking my boy down to Halifax.

Mr. MORPHY: Splendid. Every man who does that is entitled to all credit, and I give my hon. friend credit for sending his boy—not for sending his boy but because he has a boy who will go without being sent. But if the hon. gentleman and his leader had done what should have been done, instead of standing back and playing the game of politics, we would have had a splendid army of 100,000 men, instead of 6,000, from the province of Quebec. Let me come to the point, so that my hon. friend from St. John will not think wrong about it. There are grandfathers in my county of the boys who are gone to the front, old men who came into the county in the pioneer days, who pioneered the farms, and built up their homes, but have never been naturalized because in the early days no one thought of it. Some of them took an oath of allegiance. Now because these men happen to have been born in Germany, although their sons and grandsons are fighting for you, Mr. Chairman, and for the country at large, you are going to disfranchise them under this Bill. A finer and more loyal body of citizens never lived in any country in the world. Their sons are as British, and even much more British, than some men in this House. They are absolutely intrepid and fearless. They have gone forward and have done their duty like soldiers, and have died like men. They have won honours which have reflected glory upon the Dominion of Canada. Why could not the grandfathers of those boys be naturalized in some way? Why should they not be recognized? Why should not this Bill be so amended so that the old men, past military age, should, through the grace of this House if nothing else, be given that right of citizenship which they have earned through their pioneer days by the fulfillment of all their duties and by voting consistently from year to year? Why should they not be given the right to vote in this Bill?

Mr. PUGSLEY: The hon. member is very late in suggesting this. It is a quarter to two now.

Mr. MORPHY: There is an excuse for being late. The time has been frittered away by hon. gentlemen opposite. I was only forced to speak when I saw I had a real opening because hon. gentlemen were complaining they were gagged, yet the gag was not so tight that they failed to fill in the time, and they let me in. I ask the Solicitor General to consider, even at this late hour, whether something cannot be done along the lines I have suggested. Say something that will satisfy what I look upon as the fair claim of these men whose sons and grandsons have gone to the front to fight the battle of freedom, to fight for hon. gentle-

men on the other side of the House as well as on this side.

Mr. MEIGHEN: It is true there are numbers in the province of Ontario, and there are some in other provinces, who have sons and grandsons enlisted, and who are not able to vote. The hon. member for North Perth (Mr. Morphy) is not speaking strictly correctly when he states they are disfranchised by this Bill. No man who has a son or grandson at the front is disfranchised no matter what race he belongs to. No man who has a brother in the overseas forces is disfranchised by this Bill, no matter what race or country he comes from. The trouble is there are men who, although they may have exercised the ballot, have not been naturalized, consequently they are not able to vote. They have never been legally qualified, and they are not now. Their status is not changed in the least. The law as to them is precisely as it was before. To meet the suggestion as the hon. member for North Perth stated it would involve the giving of the franchise to other than British subjects in the country. In the case of military voters, those who have gone overseas and are fighting in France, though we went, as far as we believe any Government in the world has gone, and as far as we believe we could, we did not go so far as to enfranchise even the soldier himself if he were not a British subject. Consequently, I think it would be going too far, if we were now to entertain the idea of enfranchising the relatives of the soldiers who may not be British subjects. They labour under a disability at the present time which I freely admit is in certain cases a hardship. In many instances, through no fault of their own they have not been naturalized; in many cases they believed they were naturalized, and they lived for years having taken some oath of allegiance, and in the sincere belief that they were naturalized, and they exercised all the functions of citizenship. Many of them made the very best citizens in this country. However, when the war broke out, the subject of naturalization became a live one, and men began to inquire. It was ascertained that very many who thought they were naturalized as a matter of fact were never naturalized at all, and very many more who had paid no attention whatever to the subject became alive to the conviction that they were not really British citizens at all. After the outbreak of the war the British Government sent a despatch to this Government to the effect that they in Great Britain were not naturalizing any alien enemy subjects, and suggesting that we follow the same practice in Canada. We were in this position: We had a Naturalization Act which had been on our statute-book for years, which prescribed the conditions of naturalization as three years' residence, and certain oaths, etc., and which placed the power to naturalize in the hands of the judges. That Act was still in force. Men had come to this country on the faith of that Act and had assumed duties of citizenship relying upon it being carried out. Consequently, we did not feel we should interfere with the exercise of the right of our judges to enfranchise under the Act, and we so notified the British Government. But aside from that restriction, aside from that limitation, we have abided by the practice followed by the British Government and the request they made of us. The result is this: that some judges under the old Act have granted naturalization; others have refused it. The practice in the province of Ontario, following the decision of Chief Justice Meredith, has been to refuse naturalization. Consequently, in the province of Ontario, there has been no naturalization by the judges under the old Act, and there has been no naturalization under the new Act by the Secretary of State, on account of the understanding with the British Government.

Mr. MORPHY: Does the hon. gentleman not realise that there is a great distinction between the German who is living in England and the rural, frugal German who comes to till the land in Canada?

Mr. MEIGHEN: I think the hon. gentleman is right.

Mr. PUGSLEY: As he does in the three prairie provinces.

Mr. MEIGHEN: In the three prairie provinces the case is not the same, because in Ontario many of them have been there since Confederation.

Mr. MORPHY. For sixty years.

Mr. MEIGHEN: I think it might well be that consideration could be given to the request of my hon. friend from North Perth (Mr. Morphy) that there should be some relaxation in this country of the practice applied in Great Britain and impliedly though not specifically acceded to by the Government of Canada in dispatches. Some consideration might well be given to the question of admitting to naturalization in proper cases those who though of alien

origin have resided in this country such length of time and under such conditions that it is a hardship upon them to deny them naturalization. I can say to my hon. friend from North Perth that the most careful possible consideration will be given in this regard.

Mr. CARVELL: I would like to ask the Minister why he would grant naturalization and the vote to the German in Ontario—

Mr. MEIGHEN: Not the vote.

Mr. CARVELL:—and refuse it to the German in western Canada.

Mr. MEIGHEN: I did not say the vote.

Mr. CARVELL: What on earth is the use of naturalization unless you give the vote?

Mr. MORPHY: A good deal.

Mr MEIGHEN: What I say applies everywhere and to every province.

Mr. CARVELL: Does the hon. gentleman mean to say that he will grant a German in Ontario naturalization and he will not grant him a vote?

Mr. MEIGHEN: He will not get a vote because he will not have been naturalized for fifteen years. Of course he would if he had a son at the front.

Mr. CARVELL: Then you are doing that in order to get votes.

Mr. MEIGHEN: The hon. gentleman has quite misunderstood me. The matter of votes has nothing to do with the suggestion of the hon. member for North Perth. It was merely a question of whether the Naturalization Act would be administered in such cases as these.

Mr. PUGSLEY: Before the time expires I desire——

Mr. CURRIE: I desire to make a personal explanation.

Mr. PUGSLEY: The honourable gentleman can make his explanation after I have finished.

Mr. L. A. LAPOINTE: Mr. Chairman, I desire to ask a question.

The CHAIRMAN (Mr. Rainville): The honourable member for North Simcoe desires to make a personal explanation.

Mr. PUGSLEY: He may do so when I get through.

The CHAIRMAN: The honourable member for St. John (Mr. Pugsley) caught my eye first.

[Mr. Meighen.]

Mr. PUGSLEY: I hold in my hand—

Mr. CURRIE: I wish to make a personal explanation.

Mr. PUGSLEY: I hold in my hand—

Some Hon. MEMBER: Order, order.

Mr. L. A. LAPOINTE: I was up before the honourable member for St. John and I have a question to ask.

The CHAIRMAN: The honourable member for St. John caught my eye first.

Mr. L. A. LAPOINTE: May I be allowed to ask a question on the Bill?

The CHAIRMAIN: It cannot be asked unless the honourable member for St. John consents to it. Similarly, the honourable member for North Simcoe (Mr. Currie) cannot make a personal explanation unless the honourable member for St. John consents.

Mr. L. A. LAPOINTE: It will only take half a minute.

Mr. CURRIE: I will only occupy a minute.

Mr. PUGSLEY: I will give way to the honourable member for Montreal, St. James (Mr. Lapointe).

Mr. L. A. LAPOINTE: I want to ask the Secretary of State how many enumerators he will have to name by Order in Council for the province of Quebec? There are 65 counties.

Mr. MEIGHEN: How many polling subdivisions to the country on the average?

Mr. L. A. LAPOINTE:

Subject to the provisions of section 65a of this Act the Governor in Council may appoint enumerators in each province to make lists of the electors in each electoral district, and the returning officer of each electoral district shall assign one of such enumerators to each polling district therein.

Mr. PUGSLEY: I only gave way to allow my honourable friend to ask a question. I must ask my honourable friend to allow me to proceed.

Some hon. MEMBERS: Order.

The CHAIRMAN: Order.

Mr. L. A. LAPOINTE: I have the floor.

The CHAIRMAN: Order, let the honourable gentleman (Mr. L. A. Lapointe) take his seat. The honourable member for St. John just gave way to allow the honourable member for Montreal, St. James, to ask a question.

Some Hon. MEMBERS: Sit down.

The CHAIRMAN: The honourable member for St. John just gave way for one question and I think the honourable member for Montreal, St. James, got a little farther than one question.

Mr. PUGSLEY: The honourable gentleman will have a chance a little later.

Mr. LAPOINTE: I cannot ask a question?

Mr. CURRIE: It is my right to make a personal explanation. Under the rules I am entitled to do so. What I wish to explain to the committee—

Some Hon. MEMBERS: Order, order.

The CHAIRMAN: Order.

Mr. PUGSLEY: I decline to give way to the honourable gentleman.

Mr. CURRIE: I do not want to be charged—

Some Hon. MEMBERS: Order.

The CHAIRMAN: Order. I have been allowing hon. members every possible latitude in the discussion of this Bill and if they will look at Hansard to-morrow I think they will find that a great deal of work has been done. Now, the hon. member for St. John has the floor and if he objects to subject he has a right to do so.

Mr. PUGSLEY: Mr. Chairman—

Mr. CURRIE: I rise to a point of order—

Mr. PUGSLEY: I hold in my hand the memorandum which was submitted by the Minister of Marine and Fisheries to the Solicitor General a portion of which I propose to put on Hansard because it has special reference to the point I made this evening, that no reasonable excuse can be given for discriminating between the soldiers who have joined the expeditionary force and are still in Canada and those who are members of the naval forces. No reason can be given for giving votes to the relatives of those who are in the naval service and not giving them to those who have joined the expeditionary forces and who still remain in Canada. The memorandum, which has been prepared by Mr. Desbarats, the deputy minister, is as follows:

The War-Time Elections Act.

The first section of this Act would give the right to vote to certain female relatives of "any person, male or female, living or dead, who is serving or has served without Canada in any of the military forces, or within or without Canada in any of the naval forces, of Canada, or of Great Britain in the present war."

Some hon. MEMBERS: Time, time.

Mr. PUGSLEY: I have still fifteen minutes. When a member rises before two o'clock, he has twenty minutes. That is the view of the Speaker and I think the Solicitor General will agree to it. I would not violate the rule but the words are that you shall not rise to speak after two o'clock.

Mr. EDWARDS: I rise to a point of order.

Some Hon. MEMBERS: Sit down.

Mr. EDWARDS: No, I have a right to rise to a point of order. The hon. member for St. John, having spoken before, has exhausted his right to the twenty minutes.

Mr. PUGSLEY: I did not speak after the rule was invoked. Hon. gentlemen were speaking with the unanimous consent of the House, and I had not spoken.

Mr. CURRIE: The hon. gentleman was on his feet immediately before I spoke, and addressed the House.

Mr. PUGSLEY: That was not a speech.

The CHAIRMAN: I think the point of order is well taken. We are proceeding under clause 17B of the rules of the House. Practically every member has spoken on the question many times. It was simply by tolerance that they were permitted to discuss this matter without the enforcement of the twenty-minute limit. As the debate was conducted in that way, I think the hon. member for St. John will not insist in speaking after two o'clock, as the time limit is being enforced.

Mr. PUGSLEY: Allow me to call attention—

Some Hon. MEMBERS: Order.

Mr. PUGSLEY: Let us keep order for a few minutes; it is the desire of all the members that we shall close this debate with reasonable dignity and in a good spirit. The words of the rule are that "no member shall rise to speak after that hour," that is, after two o'clock. I have had an opportunity of speaking of this with the Speaker and I am sure from what he said to me that in His Honour's view, if a member rises before two o'clock he has his twenty minutes. He gave a similar ruling in favour of my hon. friend from Rouville (Mr. Lemieux).

Mr. EDWARDS: I rise to another point of order. That is, that you, having ruled

that my first point is well taken, the only thing the hon. member for St. John can do, if he does not agree with that ruling, is to appeal against it. He has no right to speak again, as it is after two o'clock, and, under the rule, we should take the vote.

Mr. PUGSLEY: The Chairman did not rule, he just expressed a wish.

The CHAIRMAN: As we have been proceeding by tolerance all day, if the hon. member for Frontenac (Mr. Edwards) would be kind enough not to press his point of order, then the hon. member for St. John (Mr. Pugsley) will finish his remarks may be in ten minutes.

Some Hon. MEMBERS: No, no.

Mr. EDWARDS: If it was the case of a member who had not used up the time of the House ad libitum I would not say anything about it, but I must insist upon my point.

Some Hon. MEMBERS: Order.

Mr. MARCILE: While it is two o'clock—

Mr. PUGSLEY: This memorandum—

Some Hon. MEMBERS: Order.

Mr. PUGSLEY: This memorandum gives every woman the right to vote who—

Mr. CHAIRMAN: As the hon. member for Frontenac (Mr. Edwards) has insisted on his point of order, I rule that, it being after two o'clock, no one can speak as the time limit to speak was used up by every member who took part in the discussion during the day. Each member spoke more than twenty minutes.

Mr. MARCILE: I wish to ask the Secretary of State one question.

Some Hon. MEMBERS: Order, order. Sit down.

Mr. MARCILE: It is absolutely unfair. Am I not to be allowed to ask a question?

The CHAIRMAN: Shall section 1 of the Bill as amended be adopted?

Carried on division.

The CHAIRMAN: Shall section 2 be adopted?

Mr. L. A. LAPOINTE: I had the honour to place in your hands an amendment.

The CHAIRMAN: Shall clause 2 as amended be adopted?

Some Hon. MEMBERS: Carried. Lost.

Mr. MEIGHEN: If I may be permitted, the point taken by the hon. member for St. James (Mr. Lapointe) is well taken. He submitted an amendment to this clause, which I think should be put first. The amendment was to effect that the hour for closing the polls be eight o'clock instead of five.

Mr. MURPHY: Generally?

Mr. MEIGHEN: Yes.

Amendment, Mr. Lapointe, negatived on division, yeas 26, nays 50.

Section 2 as amended agreed to on division.

Section 3 as amended agreed to on division.

Schedule agreed to on division.

Title agreed to on division.

Bill reported, and amendments read the first time.

Mr. PUGSLEY: Before this report is acted upon I desire to make some remarks in regard to it. I do so under rule 56, which provides that after report the Bill is open to debate and amendment before it is ordered for a third reading.

Mr. MEIGHEN: I submit that this rule was overruled by the rule which was adopted in 1913. The new rule supersedes the old, because it specifically declares what motions are debatable. Of course, all that is before the House now is the motion for the receiving of the report.

2 a.m.

Mr. PUGSLEY: No, the report is received.

Mr. MEIGHEN: If the report is received, the motion for concurrence is not debatable.

Mr. SPEAKER: The honourable gentleman could not properly speak on the motion that the amendments be read the second time and concurred in. According to the decision which I gave in the House not long ago, under rule 17A that motion is not debatable.

Mr. PUGSLEY: I did not know that Your Honour had so ruled.

Mr. SPEAKER: Does the honourable member rise to a point of order?

Mr. PUGSLEY: Yes. The question is one of great importance, affecting the rights of the minority; therefore, I bring it specially to Your Honour's notice. Rule 56 specifically deals with—

Some hon. MEMBERS: Order.

Mr. PUGSLEY: I think your honour will say that I am in order.

Mr. SPEAKER: I am permitting the member for St. John to make some remarks on the point of order.

Mr. PUGSLEY: It is true, as the Solicitor General suggests, that we have rule 17A, but we have also a special rule, rule 56, bearing upon a particular point. Rule 56, which has not been repealed, says :

All amendments made in committee are reported by the chairman to the House, which shall receive the same forthwith. After report the Bill is open to debate and amendment, before it is ordered for a third reading. But when a Bill is reported without amendment it is forthwith ordered to be read a third time at such time as may be appointed by the House.

It is argued by the Solicitor General that that rule is inconsistent with rule 17 A. When we have a rule dealing with general matters and also a special rule stating what shall take place in a particular instance, that special rule would not be overruled by the general rule. If the House had intended when it adopted rule 17 A to repeal rule 56 it would have done so. But it did not do so; therefore, rule 56 is still in force. I think that if there is any doubt in the matter Your Honour should decide in favour of rule 56, because the rights of the minority in this House are very much restricted. It should be borne in mind also that this Government, by virtue of its majority, can declare anything to be carried. I await Your Honour's interpretation of the rule in full confidence that the House will support your decision. It seems to me to be clear that under rule 56 the Bill is now open to debate and amendment.

Mr. SPEAKER: The point of order raised by the member for St. John is, indeed, a most important one; I have had occasion to give the matter consideration within the past few days. As a matter of fact, the point has already been settled by decision of the House, to be found on page 5374 of Hansard of August 29, 1917. Rule 56 is in conflict with rule 17 A, but rule 56 was in the rule book and was prior in point of time to rule 17 A, which, overriding all other rules, was designed specifically for the purpose of restricting debate. If the interpretation placed upon the rule by the member for St. John were sustained, the express object which the House had in mind when it enacted rule 17 A would be defeated. Notwithstanding that, I am cognizant of the import of the point raised by my hon. friend. It is very clear in my mind that rule 17 A must prevail; that it must override rule 56 and that, therefore, it is not open to the hon. gentleman to enter into a discussion at this stage of the proceedings. In any case the discussion could take place only on the motion which I now propose to put: that the amendments be now read the second time and concurred in; and under rule 17 A that motion is not debatable.

It is moved by Mr. Meighen, seconded by Mr. Hazen, that the said amendments be now read the second time and concurred in. Is it the pleasure of the House to adopt the motion?

Some hon. MEMBERS: Carried.

Some hon. MEMBERS: Lost.

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

On the motion of Hon. Mr. Meighen, the House adjourned at 2.20 a.m. Thursday.

Thursday, September 13, 1917.

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

THE DRY DOCK SUBSIDIES ACT, 1910.

RESOLUTION AGREED TO AND BILL INTRODUCED.

On the Government Notice of Motion:

Mr. Reid—In Committee of the Whole—Will move, that the resolution of August 1 with respect to amending the Dry Dock Subsidies Act, 1910, be amended and that all the words after the words "sum of" in the eighth line be struck out and the words "one million dollars" be substituted in lieu thereof.

Hon. J. D. REID (Acting Minister of Public Works): This is for the purpose of amending the resolution contained in No. 20 of the Orders of the Day. What I wish, with the consent of the House, to do, is to pass this resolution and then take it up in connection with Order No. 20 of the Orders of the Day.

Mr. SPEAKER: Do I understand that the minister desires to go in Committee of the Whole on this resolution to-day?

Mr. REID: Yes.

Mr. SPEAKER: As it is not an Order of the Day, the minister cannot do so except by consent of the House.

Mr. REID: When we come to the Orders of the Day, I want to take up Order No. 20 with reference to dry docks. This is an

amendment to that resolution, and if the House will consent, I would like to pass this resolution and then take it up when we go into committee on No. 20 of the Orders of the Day.

On the motion of Hon. Mr. Reid, the House went into committee on the following proposed motion, Mr. W. H. Bennett in the Chair:

That the resolution of August 1 with respect to amending the Dry Dock Subsidies Act, 1910, be amended and that all the words after the words "sum of" in the eighth line be struck out and the words "one million dollars" be substituted in lieu thereof.

Sir WILFRID LAURIER: Explain.

Mr. REID: I intend, when we reach the Orders of the Day, to move resolution No. 20 which is to amend the Dry Dock Act. The object of that resolution is to provide for increasing the width of dry docks from 110 to 125 feet. This is being done at the request of the Admiralty. In addition to that we want to increase the depth over the sill from 37 feet to 38 feet. We are also increasing the rate of interest from 4 to 4½ per cent. There is another clause that we propose asking the committee to consider, namely, that, on a dry dock which is being constructed, we may issue bonds to the extent of 75 per cent of the amount invested after $1,000,000 have been expended. The resolution which is on the Order Paper in the name of the Hon. Mr. Rogers was discussed on August 13, and it was found it was not in accordance with the intention of the minister at that time, and it had to be amended. That is why this amendment is being moved.

Mr. PUGSLEY: As I understand it, the substitution of the words "one million dollars" for "five hundred thousand dollars" in no way increases the liability of the country, but rather restricts it. $1,000,000 must be expended before progress estimates can be given. The original resolution stated that $500,000 must first be expended. Therefore, this is a greater safeguard to the public.

Mr. REID: That is the position exactly.

Mr. CARVELL: Does this change it in any way so that the Government is responsible for the bonds, or is it only responsible for the interest? This Act was passed a good many years ago, and my recollection is that it provides only for the payment of interest for a certain number of years. Is there any change in the liability resulting to the country, apart from the increase in the rate of interest from 4 to 4½ per cent?

Mr. REID: There is a change. A new clause is being added. Under the old Act the dry dock had to be completed before any bonds were guaranteed.

Mr. MURPHY: That is not the point.

Mr. PUGSLEY: What the hon. member asks is whether there is any liability on the part of the Government to pay the principal. There is no change in that.

Mr. REID: No.

Sir THOMAS WHITE: There is no guarantee of bonds. There is just a payment of interest.

Resolution reported, read the first and second time and concurred in.

Mr. REID thereupon moved for leave to introduce Bill No. 134 to amend the Dry Docks Subsidies Act, 1910.

Motion agreed to and Bill read the first time.

THE BATTLE OF LENS.

CANADIAN CASUALTIES AT LENS—RECRUITING AND WASTAGE BETWEEN 16TH ND 31ST AUGUST.

On the Orders of the Day:

Hon. Sir EDWARD KEMP (Minister of Militia and Defence): In reply to a question put by the hon. member for Victoria and Haliburton (Sir Sam Hughes) the other day as to the casualties amongst Canadians in the fighting around Lens, the casualties at the front in the Canadian Expeditionary Force so far reported for the period from the 16th to the 31st of August were 7,586. This covers the period of exceptionally severe fighting in and around Lens, where the Canadian forces were heavily engaged. The discharges in Canada during the same period for various causes were 689. This gives a total wastage of 8,275. The total recruits in combatant arms during the same period was approximately 800, making a net wastage of approximately 7,475.

Sir WILFRID LAURIER: How are the casualties distributed? How many men were killed, how many wounded, how many missing, and so forth?

Sir EDWARD KEMP: I shall be glad to get that information.

CANADIAN EXPEDITIONARY FORCE.

POSITION OF RETURNED OFFICERS UNDER MILITARY SERVICE ACT.

On the Orders of the Day:

Sir EDWARD KEMP: The hon. member for Prescott (Mr. Proulx) asked me in the House the other day whether the surplus of officers who have been returned to Canada would be liable for service under the Military Service Act. The information my hon. friend desires is given in the Military Service Act, 78 George V, Chapter 19, in sections 2 and section 13, subsections 1 and 2, and in the schedule to the Act, paragraph 5.

OVERSEAS EXPEDITIONARY FORCE.

PAY OF SOLDIERS PROMOTED AND OF OFFICERS WHO REVERT IN RANK.

On the Orders of the Day:

Sir EDWARD KEMP: The hon. member for Carleton (Mr. Carvell) the other day asked the following question:

> I wish to ask the Minister of Militia whether it is a fact that men who have been promoted on the field in France and Flanders, and who, having been wounded, return to the base or to Canada, receive only the pay of the position which they occupied when they left Canada, while men who received their appointment in England or in Canada, upon being wounded, receive the pay of their present rank.

So far as the department is aware, men who have been promoted on the field in France and Flanders, and who have been wounded, and returned to the base, continue to receive the pay of the permanent grade held at the time they were wounded. Men who have received their appointment in England or in Canada, upon being sent overseas, and who have been wounded, would similarly receive the pay of the permanent grade they occupied in their overseas unit.

The above does not apply to men who are holding acting rank only. When men with acting rank are wounded, they receive the pay of their permanent rank.

Mr. F. B. CARVELL: I understand the minister to say that the men receive pay according to the rank which they held at the time of being wounded.

Sir EDWARD KEMP: The pay depends upon the conditions which I have just indicated.

Mr. CARVELL: I know of a case in New Brunswick, where a man who was promoted on the field to the rank of Major, and who was afterwards wounded, and returned to Canada, has been receiving the pay of a Lieutenant all the time. I can give the minister his name privately.

Sir EDWARD KEMP: I shall be glad if my hon. friend would, as there may be some irregularity about this case.

Sir SAM HUGHES: I understand that there are some cases where an officer who was acting in a higher rank—for instance, a captain acting as a major—and who had been recommended for promotion which had not been given at the time of his death, has been overlooked. Will the minister look into that matter?

Sir EDWARD KEMP: Yes. In reply to a question by my hon. friend the other day on this subject I would say that officers who voluntarily revert in England to a lower rank, in order to go to the front, receive the pay of their lower rank, but their wives continue to receive separation allowance of the original rank which the officers held prior to reversion.

CERTIFICATES TO THOSE MEDICALLY UNFIT.

On the Orders of the Day:

Sir EDWARD KEMP: The hon. member for Pictou (Mr. Macdonald) said the other day that he had seen it stated in the press that certificates were to be given to men who had offered to enlist but who had been refused on account of medical unfitness. I would say that, in accordance with Order in Council 2199, of the 10th August, 1917, a badge and certificate known as Class "D" will be given to those who have offered themselves for active service in the Canadian Expeditionary Force, and have been rejected as, and who still are, medically unfit. As no list of those who offered to enlist and were refused on account of medical unfitness has been kept by this department, the Order in Council above mentioned requires such applicants to undergo a further medical examination and supply proof, by statutory declaration or otherwise, that they come within Class "D." I shall lay the Order in Council on the Table.

COLONEL JOHN ALLISTER CURRIE, M.P.

STATEMENT BY SIR SAM HUGHES DENYING ALLEGATIONS.

On the Orders of the Day:

The Hon. Sir SAM HUGHES: I rise to a question of privilege. My attention has just been drawn to some remarks made in the House yesterday concerning Colonel

John Currie. The gentleman addressing the House said:

"I may tell him he was found up to his neck in a dugout when he should have been at the front leading his men."

This does not concern Colonel John Currie in any sense whatever. This story was told—

Mr. SPEAKER: Order. Unless the hon. gentleman wishes to deny or qualify some remark in respect to himself he is not in order in bringing this matter up on a question of privilege.

Sir SAM HUGHES: I will deny some remarks concerning myself. The next statement of the hon. gentleman was:

"When he came to this country looking for promotion the then Minister of Militia refused to give him promotion, because he was not entitled to it."

Neither of the two statements I have read is correct. I may say that I recommended Colonel Currie for promotion to the rank of Brigadier General. Owing to the fact that rumours had been passed around concerning him by his enemies, I had previously investigated them and found them absolutely without foundation in fact. There was no intention to hit Colonel Currie when these rumours were first started, but gossip soon gets going, and it was decided to hold up the recommendation until a full report was obtained. Subsequently I recommended his promotion to the rank of Brigadier General and he acted as Brigadier until recently. Later on, Colonel Currie complained in the House that he had not been decorated for his splendid service at the battle of St. Julien. That statement of his had no connection whatever, as I understand it, with my action in recommending him for promotion. I was not present when he made these remarks in the House, but judging by the Hansard report, he seemed to think that General Alderson and I should have recommended him for some decoration on the field. I explained in the House that I had nothing whatever to do with that, and would not think of interfering. So the statements made yesterday in the House concerning Colonel Currie and myself are absolutely without foundation.

PRIVILEGE.

STATEMENT BY MR. NEELY IN REFERENCE TO AN INTERVIEW WITH SIR CLIFFORD SIFTON CONTRADICTING STATEMENTS MADE BY THE LATTER.

Mr. D. B. NEELY (Humboldt): I wish to speak on a question of privilege. On Saturday last in the city of Chatham I made a statement in regard to a more or less public man in this country, not a member of this House but who was once a member of this House. I find in the Toronto Daily Star of September 10, that this gentleman, Sir Clifford Sifton, as politely as possible gives my statement the lie, and directly contradicts what I said at the public meeting referred to. My statement in the city of Chatham on Saturday last was that on the 8th day of June last I met Sir Clifford Sifton opposite his office in the city of Ottawa, and that he invited me to his office—

Some hon. MEMBERS: Order.

Mr. NEELY: I am giving the statement so that I may explain the denial Sir Clifford Sifton has made in which he charges me with misrepresenting the facts.

Mr. SPEAKER: The hon. member (Mr. Neely) purposes to give denial to some statements made outside the House. I doubt if that is a question of privilege. If the statements were made in the House he would be quite in order.

Sir WILFRID LAURIER: The hon. gentleman is calling attention to a statement in the newspapers. I think he has a right to do that.

Mr. SPEAKER: If it called in question his action as a public man, he would be in order.

Sir WILFRID LAURIER: He says he made the statement in a speech which was reported in the newspapers. Then he finds another newspaper denying the statement he made. Do you not think he is entitled to establish the facts as they are? All this appeared in the public press. As a matter of fact, some time ago I corrected a statement made in a similar way.

Mr. SPEAKER: As a matter of general principle I desire to give every opportunity to an hon. member who rises to a question of privilege to make his statement, but as the hon. member for Humboldt (Mr. Neely) proceeded, it appeared that he had reference to a difference between him and a gentleman who is not a member of this House. If the hon. member's action as a public man is called in question, he would be quite in order in explaining it.

Mr. NEELY: I was speaking as a public man, and I have been given the lie direct. That charge against my truthfulness has been published in the press throughout the

country from coast to coast. The statement I made in Chatham on Saturday last was to the effect that on the 8th day of June Sir Clifford Sifton, in an interview with me, pronounced himself as against putting conscription into force in Canada at the present time. In the Toronto Star of September 10 he, Sir Clifford Sifton, is quoted as making the following statement with reference to that interview:

I said that I regretted very much there was likely to be a split on the subject of conscription, in which different portions of the country would be arraigned against each other, but that it was quite clear to me that the English-speaking Liberals in the House ought not to follow Sir Wilfrid Laurier on this question. Dr. Neely asked me what I thought they ought to do. I said that they ought to organize themselves and repudiate the stand taken by Sir Wilfrid Laurier, and at the same time announce their intention of supporting conscription and supporting the Government in its war policy.

That gives me the direct lie as to the statement I made. I made this statement outside of the House, as a public man, so that I could not claim the protection of this Parliament in making it. In the statement I made I have the support of the member for Norfolk (Mr. Charlton) the member for Quebec West (Mr. Power) and the member for Richmond and Wolfe (Mr. Tobin). The hon. member for Quebec West stated over his own signature that at or about the same time Sir Clifford Sifton expressed to him exactly the same views as he expressed to me, and instead of the statement that he had advised me to organize those who proposed to vote for conscription on this side of the House I say emphatically that Sir Clifford Sifton told me to get the so-called conscriptionist Liberals toogether and see if there was no common ground on which they could support the stand of the leader of the Opposition because that was the proper stand at the present time in this country.

As verification of what I say I have in my hand the signed statement of the hon. member for Quebec West which sets out that views similar to those expressed to me by Sir Clifford Sifton were expressed to him on the 7th day of June by the said Sir Clifford Sifton, and that it was proposed to him that he should give an interview to the editor of the Manitoba Free Press who was to be in Ottawa in a few days. The hon. member for Quebec West, whose views on this question have never swerved from the beginning, and who was against the application of conscription as everybody knows—

Some hon. MEMBERS: Order.

Mr. NEELY: I am giving my evidence to establish that my statement is correct. The hon. member for Quebec West agreed to give this interview and went to his home at the week end. While there on June 9 he received the following telegram:

Ottawa, Ont., June 9, 1917.

Hon. William Power, M.P.,
Quebec.

Find that no useful purpose will now be served by doing as suggested yesterday. Am leaving town tomorrow.

Clifford Sifton.

I make these statements because of the fact that this public man through a newspaper which he owns in the city of Winnipeg, the Manitoba Free Press——

Mr. SPEAKER: Order. I think the hon. member is going too far. He has been given opportunity to make a complete denial and to state his position, and I think he should be content.

Mr. NEELY: I was just going to say that it was because of misrepresentation previous to this as to the attitude of the conscriptionist Liberals in this House—

Mr. SPEAKER: Order.

Mr. NEELY: Then, I will leave that out. I would call your attention Mr. Speaker, and the attention of the House, to this very remarkable admission on the part of Sir Clifford Sifton in his denial.

It is quite true, however, that in common with many others in favour of conscription at different times, I have in discussing the question, recognized the difficulty of enforcing it, and that it would have been desirable to have got recruits by voluntary enlistment if possible. In this respect my opinion does not differ from that of any other intelligent person familiar with political conditions in Canada.

So out of the mouth of my detractor I prove my own truthfulness.

EXPLOSION AT WATERFORD, N.S.—RELIEF OF DEPENDENTS.

On the Orders of the Day:

Mr. G. W. KYTE (Richmond): In the absence of the Prime Minister I desire to call the attention of the Minister of Labour to the following telegram which I have received:

Glace Bay, N.S., Sept. 10, 1917.

G. W. Kyte, M.P.,
Ottawa, Ont.

Would appreciate further effort from you secure Government contribution towards relief of dependents left by Waterford explosion. Telegraphed Sir Robert Borden to-day on this matter.

J. B. Maclachlan,
Secretary Amalgamated Mine Workers of Nova Scotia.

I would ask the Minister of Labour if the matter of providing funds for the relief of the dependents of those who were killed in that explosion has been considered by the Government.

Hon. T. W. CROTHERS (Minister of Labour): Some time ago the matter was considered by the Government but the parties particularly interested replied that they did not desire any donation, inasmuch as the dependents of those men were fully protected by the company. Nothing has since been done by the Government.

EXPORT ON APPLES TO THE UNITED KINGDOM.

THE EMBARGO ON CANADIAN APPLES IN GREAT BRITAIN NOT TO BE REMOVED.

On the Orders of the Day:

Mr. A. K. MACLEAN (Halifax): I would ask the Minister of Trade and Commerce if he has any information with respect to the embargo against the importation of apples into the United Kingdom?

Right Hon. Sir GEORGE FOSTER (Minister of Trade and Commerce): I received a cable from the Secretary of State for the colonies in which he regrets that it is impossible to raise the embargo on apples. He says the matter was given very thorough and sympathetic consideration, but owing to financial and tonnage conditions it has been found impossible to give the permission that was asked for.

APPLICATION OF EX-PRIVATE JAMES SAUVE FOR PENSION.

On the Orders of the Day:

Hon. CHARLES MARCIL: I wish to put a question to the hon. Minister of Militia and Defence (Sir Edward Kemp). As a member of the committee appointed by this House to investigate the treatment given to returned soldiers, my attention was called this morning to the case of ex-Private James Sauve, No. 144070, 38th Overseas battalion——

Mr. SPEAKER: A minister cannot possibly give an answer to a question with respect to one private out of thousands. I would ask the hon. member to place his question on the Order Paper in the ordinary course and he will get an answer.

Mr. MARCIL: I would ask the Minister of Militia and Defence if it is in the ordinary course for the department to allow a soldier, honourably discharged in Kingston on the 17th May, after good conduct and good service, to wait until this date in September before getting a pension of any kind.

Sir EDWARD KEMP: The question which the hon. gentleman asked has reference to a matter which does not come under the Department of Militia and Defence, but I may say that a soldier receives his full pay until his pension is granted.

Mr. MARCIL: The Minister of Militia and Defence, having declared that he had nothing to do with pensions, would I be allowed to direct the attention of the right hon. gentleman who is now leading the House (Sir George Foster) to the case of a man discharged on the 17th May at Kingston and allowed to go until the 13th of September without having any attention paid to his application for a pension?

Sir GEORGE FOSTER: Would it not be well for my hon. friend (Mr. Marcil) to write a letter giving the circumstances of the case and address it to the chairman of the Pensions Board? Ministers have a vast number of questions and a great deal of responsibility in reference to them, but my hon. friend must not try to load too much on the ministers. If he will get into direct communication with the chairman of the Pension Board and give the exact facts of the case, he will get his answer much quicker than by asking a question on the Orders of the Day.

NEW CANADIAN WAR LOAN.

On the Orders of the Day:

Mr. G. H. BOIVIN (Shefford): I would like to ask the hon. the Minister of Finance (Sir Thomas White) when he will be in a position to give an official statement to the House concerning the new Canadian War Loan, which, it is rumoured in the press, will be placed on the market in October.

Sir THOMAS WHITE: It is not my intention to make a statement to the House as to the forthcoming war loan. The terms and conditions of such a loan can only be determined shortly before the date of issue and it would not be possible for me, no matter how much I might desire to give the House the information, to make a statement at the present time. I may say, however, that the intention is that the loan shall be offered in November. Further than that I am unable to give any informaion.

EXPORT OF POTATOES.

MR. CARVELL SUGGESTS THE REMOVAL OF THE DUTY ON POTATOES.

On the Orders of the Day:

Mr. F. B. CARVELL (Carleton, N.B.): A week or so ago I asked the Government if they would not consider the advisability of removing the duty on potatoes, the effect of which would be that our potatoes would have the right to enter the United States free of duty. I was promised consideration of the matter and I would now ask the minister if he is able to give an answer.

Sir THOMAS WHITE: The matter referred to by my hon. friend (Mr. Carvell) is one relating to the tariff. Announcements of that kind are not discussed in advance for reasons which will be obvious to the House. I am unable to make any statement with respect to the matter except to say that any action the Government may take will be announced in due course. It is impossible for me to make a statement in reference to the matter at the present time.

Mr. CARVELL: If the Government could put wheat on the free list by Order in Council they could put potatoes on the free list in the same way. It would not need any tariff change.

SUPPLY.

The House again in Committee of Supply, Mr. W. H. Bennett in the Chair.

Customs—Salaries and contingent expenses, further amount required, $350,000.

Mr. KYTE: The minister promised to give the names of the officers in my constituency who would benefit by this increase.

Mr. REID: The increases proposed are as follows: At Baddeck, D. J. Macrae receives $100; Mr. Macrae receives a salary of $750; John Larusic, of Aspey Bay, receives an increase of $50. At Ingonish, T. D. Curtis receives $100. At Iona, Edward MacNeill receives $100. At Little Narrows, D. B. McKay receives $50. At Munro's Point, Angus Carmichael receives $50. At New Campbellton, W. R. McKinnon receives $100; J. A. Bain, $50; J. J. Bain, $50; Duncan Carey, $50; Alexander Harton, $50. At Neil's harbour, Edward Dowling receives $50, and at Ste. Anne's, Donald McAulay receives $100, and Alexander McLeod, $60. At White Point, P. A. Mackintosh receives $50. At St. Peter's, C. M. Morrison receives $100, and at Arichat, A. F. Boudrot, $100. At D'Escousse, Felix Landry receives $50

Mr. SINCLAIR: Would the minister give the same information for Guysborough and Antigonish?

Mr. REID: The increases are as follows: At Canso, P. C. Cullen, collector, receives $100; E. M. Hurst receives $100. At Country Harbour, J. M. Milward receives $50; H. M. Scott receives $100. At Isaac's Harbour, Hugh McMillan receives $50. At Port Hillford, J. McConnell receives $50. These have been submitted to me for my consideration by the officers of the department, and I have not had time to go over them.

Mr. SINCLAIR: Is there any increase in the office in Sherbrooke?

Mr. REID: M. J. Keating receives $100 and David Murray $100.

Mr. MARCIL: On what principle are the increases given?

Mr. REID: I have left it to the officers of the department. Men who are not really dependent on the office for their living, who receive $300 or $350 a year, receive increases of $50. Those depending almost entirely on their salaries for a living get $100.

Mr. McKENZIE: I asked for some information in reference to my constituency.

Mr. REID: That information is as follows: At Sydney and outports, P. C. Campbell gets $100; J. L. Bray, $100. Theodore Chisholm has enlisted and his case will have to stand for consideration until his return. A. D. Gillis receives $100; J. W. Kennedy, $100; Edward Macpherson, $100; Roderick McDonald, $100; A. A. McIsaac, $100; J. H. Scott, $100; A. W. Steacy, $100; James McPhee, $100; J. A. Richardson, $50; E. McGillivray receives $50, Anthony McDougall $100, and Joseph Orr $50. At Glace Bay there are three officers. A. P. O'Neill receives $100, and Daniel Keigan $100. Then we have N. F. McDonald, but he is overseas and nothing was done in his case. The understanding was that these men should get their salaries, in addition to their military pay, while overseas.

Mr. McKENZIE: Will the minister give me the names and increases of the officials at North Sydney and Sydney Mines?

Mr. REID: T. L. Brennan, enlisted for overseas, so that his salary remains as it is until he returns. Then the following offi-

cers received an increase of $100: J. H. Cammeron, John Cogan, David Edwards, F. E. Jackson, J. J. McDonald, H. W. McNeil, James McLeod, Angus Young, E. A. MacNeil. Then there are some small increases: C. J. Jessome of Little Bras d'Or, $50; John Boutilier, $50; Robert Newton, $50; D. J. McGillivray, $30; Roderick McDonald, $200; James Peck, $100.

Mr. McKENZIE: What about the official at North Sydney?

Mr. REID: Joseph McPherson; he is receiving $1,600 and about $300 for extra time.

Mr. McKENZIE: His position is about the same as that of Mr. P. C. Campbell, and they ought to be getting about the same salary.

Mr. REID: I have not gone over all these items. The salary of the official at Sydney is more than the salary of the man at North Sydney. The official at North Sydney gets about $400 out of the Inland Revenue. He holds two positions there, Collector of Customs and Collector of Inland Revenue, so that his salary is really higher in proportion than the salary of the man at North Sydney. At all events this memorandum has been submitted to me and I have to give his case consideration.

Mr. SINCLAIR: The minister has only given me the answer in regard to part of my county. I asked him in regard to Antigonish and Guysborough. He gave me the answer with regard to Guysborough, but not with reference to Antigonish.

Mr. REID: I do not know what places are in Antigonish.

Mr. SINCLAIR: I want the increases.

Mr. REID: At Antigonish a man named W. C. Chisholm is receiving $100 increase. Then there are increases to the officials in four small places, Bayfield, Cape George, Harbour au Bouche and Malignant Cove, of $50 to the following officials: W. M. Strople, Alexander McDougall, Captain John Fraser, J. D. Chisholm.

Mr. SINCLAIR: What was the increase in each case?

Mr. REID: $50.

Mr. SINCLAIR: What about Harbour au Bouche?

Mr. REID: They are all $50.

Mr. SINCLAIR: What about the official in the town of Antigonish?

[Mr. J. D. Reid.]

Mr. REID: There is just one man there, the collector, and he is getting $100 increase.

Mr. CARVELL: I should like to know the principle on which the increases are made. I would not offer any objection, if the increases were given to the men who are doing the work. In my constituency there are some officers who, I believe, are underpaid, and to whom a reasonable increase is a fair reward. I have other officers in my constituency who have never earned a dollar since they were appointed, who have never performed any services, and who hold the positions simply as rewards for political services, I would be very much obliged indeed, without publicly stating those who, in my opinion, are not earning anything, if the minister will give me the names of the officials in the port of Woodstock whose salaries have been increased. I will be able then to draw my own inference, and the people of the country will be able to arrive at their own conclusions.

Mr. REID: I really do not know the officers in the hon. gentleman's constituency. I am depending entirely on the official of the department for my information.

Mr. CARVELL: For that reason, I am not mentioning any names, but if the hon. minister will give us the names, we can easily make the application ourselves.

Mr. REID: In Woodstock proper we have three officers.

Mr. CARVELL: I think there must be a couple of dozen, taking in the outports.

Mr. REID: Does the hon. gentleman refer to the outports as well?

Mr. CARVELL: Yes, I am not concerned about the officers at Woodstock, I want to state publicly that, so far as the officers in the port of Woodstock proper are concerned, they are earning their salaries.

Mr. REID: These matters have been suggested to me. The collector at Woodstock, G. E. Balmain will receive $100 increase; Uriah Hanson, T. L. McCaffrey and G. A. Hooser will also receive $100 increase. Mr. Hoover's salary is $800. It is evidence that his whole time is taken up with the work. Then Robert Kelly, Aroostook Junction, receives an increase of $50. Mr. G. A. Giberson, Bath, receives no increase. Then there are no increases to the officials at Bloomfield, Centreville and Clair. The subcollector at Debec, Mr. J. R. Kirkpatrick receives an increase of $100.

Mr. CARVELL: What salary does that give him?

Mr. REID: His present salary is $850 and the increase will bring it to $950.

Mr. CARVELL: That official has done well during the last three years.

Mr. REID: His whole living depends on the customs work, and the commissioner thought that on account of the high cost of living that $850 was a small salary and suggested $100 increase. Then at Grand Falls, Mr. H. W. Taylor receives an increase of $100. Mr. J. B. Porter, at Lower Andover receives an increase of $50. Mr. W. H. Lindsay, of Richmond Road, receives $50. The official at St. Hilaire receives no increase. Then Joseph Desjardins, of St. Leonards, receives $100 increase, and J. J. Walsh, of the same place, receives $50 increase, J. G. Sirois, of Edmundston receives an increase of $100.

Mr. McKENZIE: There are other places in my riding I should like information about. What has the minister done at Sydney mines, Grand Narrows and Iona?

Mr. REID: I thought I read those out. At Sydney Mines, we propose giving James Peck an increase of $100.

Mr. McKENZIE: Are there not two officers at Sydney Mines?

Mr. REID: I think there is only one.

Mr. McKENZIE: The real officer at Sydney Mines is McDonald.

Mr. REID: Roderick McDonald. We purpose giving him an increase of $200. His name is on the list.

Mr. McKENZIE: What will that make his salary?

Mr. REID: $1,500 a year.

Mr. McKENZIE: I suppose that is little enough.

Mr. REID: At Grand Narrows there is E. A. McNeil whose present salary is $250. We purpose giving him an increase of $100. At Iona, there is Edward MacNeil, whose present salary is $250. We purpose giving him an increase of $100.

Mr. ROSS: What are the present salaries of the officers at Glencoe, Park Hill and Strathroy, and what increases are the officers there receiving?

Mr. REID: At Glencoe, there is J. A. Jones, whose present salary is $800. We purpose giving him an increase of $100. At Park Hill, there is a D. J. Gray, whose present salary is $850. We purpose giving him an increase of $100. At Strathroy, there is W. H. Murray, whose present salary is $250. We purpose giving him an increase of $100, making his salary $1,200.

Mr. ROSS: Who was the former officer at Park Hill?

Mr. REID: I have not the book here. If my memory serves me aright, the Park Hill office was held by a man who was formerly a member of this House or of the local legislature, and he had the post office and the customs office together. Of late years they have been separated.

Mr. ROSS: Just for one year.

Mr. REID: This man died only a short time ago. Prior to his death, complaints were made, and it was requested that the two offices should be separated. The combination was not satisfactory to any one. The officer would be occupied part of the time as postmaster and part of the time as customs officer. When he was in the post office, the work of the customs office would be neglected. At his death, we appointed the present officer at a salary of $850. I could not say what the salary of the former officer was. But when the two offices were combined, the two salaries together were less than they would be if the positions were held by different men.

Mr. KYTE: Will the minister give me the present salaries of the sub-collectors at River Bourgeois, Petit de Grat Bridge and L'Ardoise?

Mr. REID: W. S. Boyd is the present officer at River Bourgeois. His salary is $250. We purpose giving him an increase of $50. At Petit de Grat there is James Le Blanc, whose salary is $250. We purpose giving him an increase of $50. At L'Ardoise here is W. S. Brymer, whose present salary is $250. We purpose giving him an increase of $50.

Mr. KYTE: All those sub-collectors are receiving the same increase?

Mr. REID: Yes.

Mr. PROULX: Are the officers at Hawkesbury receiving an increase?

Mr. REID: I have not that here. There are only two officers at Hawkesbury.

Mr. PROULX: Dr. R. P. Pattel is the sub-collector.

Mr. REID: He holds two positions there.

Mr. PROULX: No, he is only the sub-collector.

Mr. REID: I have not that here.

Mr. PROULX: There is from the minister's town a Mr. Edmond, who is the assistant.

Mr. ROBB: I did not hear the minister make a general statement. Does this increase apply to all customs officers throughout Canada?

Mr. REID: In June and July last, we had a small amount left over that we used to give increases, and there are men who got increases then that are probably not on the present list. But the commissioner and his officials have gone over every officer from the Atlantic to the Pacific, and they have been increasing the smaller salaries more on account of the high cost of living. For instance, if a man is receiving a salary of $800 or $900, we have increased it by $100 if his living depends entirely upon the position. The amount in the estimates would give an increase of only about $75 to every official, so that we could not take them all in. We are giving some of them $100 and some of them $50. We are making it go as far as we can, and we are giving the largest increase to those whose living depends entirely on the position.

Mr. ROBB: Has the minister given due regard to length of service? If a man has been in the service a long time, is he given preference over those who have come in recently?

Mr. REID: Yes, that is taken into consideration by the officials. So far as the customs service as a whole is concerned, the commissioner and his staff have been dealing very fairly with them. The system I am carrying out is just what my predecessors in the Customs Department have done in the past. The commissioner and his staff make out a list, and it is almost entirely followed.

Mr. MARCIL: Will the minister give us a sample of what he has done in Quebec, for instance, in Bonaventure county, let us say, in Paspebiac?

Mr. REID: They are suggesting that E. W. LeGallais get an increase of $100, Joseph Beaudin an increase of $50, H. D. L. McKenzie an increase of $100, and Thomas Enright an increase of $50.

Mr. LEMIEUX: What about Magdalen Islands?

Mr. REID: C. F. Painchaud and Camille Delaney get an increase of $100.

[Mr. J. D. Reid.]

Mines and Geological Survey—Compassionate allowance to the widow of the late C. W. Drysdale, M.Sc., Ph.D., who was drowned while in the discharge of his duties on July 10, 1917, $5,000.

Mr. LEMIEUX: Was he an old officer?

Mr. MEIGHEN: No, he entered the service in 1913. He was a university graduate of McGill, and took a post graduate course somewhere in the south. His salary at the time of his appointment was $1,600.

Mr. LEMIEUX: Has he left many children?

Mr. MEIGHEN: Three children, all under four years of age. He was an exceptionally capable officer. The references to his work out in the western mining camps are really remarkable. He achieved a great deal for the Government. A short time before his death he was offered a much more lucrative position with a western mining company on account of the services that they knew he had rendered in British Columbia, but feeling that it was his duty to complete the work he was engaged on for the Government, he declined, and was promised an advance in rank on that account. At the time of his death he was receiving $2,300 a year. On the 10th of July last, in the performance of his duties, while travelling by pack train from Cochrane to the Windermere area of British Columbia, he was drowned while trying to cross the Kootenay river. His widow is left with very little indeed, except for a small amount of insurance.

Mr. COCKSHUTT: Now that the estimates of the Secretary of State are under discussion, I have a small matter to bring to his attention, as I understand it comes under his department. Some twelve or fourteen years ago it was thought well by the citizens of Brantford to erect a memorial for the purpose of suitably commemorating the invention of the telephone, and perpetuating the memory of its inventor, Dr. Bell. The citizens got together and elected the following board of directors, which was afterwards incorporated by provincial charter in 1906 as the Bell Telephone Memorial Association: W. F. Cockshutt, M.P. (President); Lloyd Harris (vice-president); W. N. Andrews; E. L. Goold; M. K. Halloran; Geo. Kippax; G. H. Muirhead; T. H. Preston, M.P.P.; F. D. Reville; A. J. Wilkes, K.C.; C. H. Waterous; John Muir (treasurer); Geo. Hately (secretary). A prospectus was issued, and we waited on the late Government in the year 1906; I think it was. My right hon. friend, the leader of

the Opposition, was good enough to listen to our request, and grant us $10,000 towards the erection of a memorial. I presume it is so long ago that hon. gentlemen may have forgotten but we appreciate the gift all the same. I have here a record of the public bodies that contributed.

The Parliament of the Dominion of Canada gave $10,000, the legislature of the province of Ontario gave $2,000, the legislature of the province of Quebec gave $1,000, the city of Brantford gave $5,000, the county of Brant gave $500, the city of Toronto gave $500 and the city of Quebec gave $100. We have been upwards of ten years working on this memorial, and I am pleased to state to the House that it is now complete and that His Excellency the Governor General will be in Brantford on October 24 next to unveil the monument. I desire to take this opportunity of inviting my right hon. friend the leader of the Government and my right hon. friend the leader of the Opposition to be present with us on that occasion. I think it will be acknowledged by all that the invention of the telephone is one of the greatest inventions of modern times. It is more in ordinary use as a commercial enterprise and for social intercourse than any other instrument. Dr. Bell is a man of the highest standing as a scientist. He is now a resident of Washington, but spends the greater part of his summers in the Maritime Provinces at a place called Baddeck. Dr. Bell was a resident of Brantford during the early part of his career. His father lived there for about twenty years, and the son who was teaching at Boston used to pay frequent and long visits to Brantford. It was on one of these occasions the telephone was invented, in the year 1874. I think this is worthy of your attention, because the United States has made a persistent effort to claim that the telephone was invented in that country. They have set up a memorial in Boston to that effect. However, we have the statement of the inventor under his own hand that the invention originated and was developed in Brantford, Ontario, Canada, in the year 1874, and that the first long distance transmissions of speech over a telephone wire or telegraph wire were made in the neighbourhood of the city of Brantord, one from Mount Pleasant to Brantford, a distance of five miles, and the other from Paris to Brantford, a distance of seven miles.

Mr. LEMIEUX: Will my hon. friend describe the memorial?

Mr. COCKSHUTT: I will give a description of the memorial in a minute or two. I want to establish the fact that we are not making any claim which is not absolutely borne out by the facts. There are hundreds of persons living in Brantford at the present time who were present at the first experiments and who know that the invention originated in the city of Brantford. Therefore we have for nearly thirty years past called ourselves the Telephone City. The old homestead of the inventor is still there and has been acquired as part of the memorial. Originally half a mile of wire was strung around the house under the eaves, and the inventor telephoned to himself sitting in his own room. That was the first experiment. After that the wires were run along a rail fence for about a mile, and then attached on telegraph poles, and taken into the city of Brantford. Then the two long distance messages I have mentioned, one from Mount Pleasant to Brantford and the other from Paris to Brantford were sent. I think we are entitled to claim that Brantford is the telephone city par excellence of the North American continent, that the telephone was invented there, and that it is a matter of no small public interest to the Dominion that Canada should be recognized as the home of the invention of the telephone, which is one of the greatest of modern inventions. I have before me a recent report which was submitted to the directors on September 10, 1917. Perhaps I cannot do better than read a brief extract from it:

> The monument has been completed in accordance with the agreement made with the sculptor, Mr. W. S. Allward, dated September 28, 1909.

He has been engaged on this great work for upwards of eight years.

> The monument is composed of Stanstead granite with bronzes as follows. Two heroic figures representing humanity sending and receiving messages, at the left and right, and a large centre panel in relief, containing five figures, representing "Man" discovering his power to transmit sound through space, with a figure over him representing "Intelligence," and three floating figures representing three messengers, "Knowledge, Joy and Sorrow." Under this panel is inscribed in the granite: "To commemorate the invention of the telephone by Alexander Graham Bell in Brantford in 1874." In the rear of the monument is a granite fountain, and the whole is bounded by a circle of granite.

The association has raised almost $60,000, including the subscriptions I have read. Many distinguished men, although not contributing very largely, have sent us subscriptions, and have placed on record their appreciation of what we were doing. Inasmuch as they are mostly public men per-

haps you would permit me to read the following expressions of opinion which we have received from several who are well known in Canada:

Duke of Argyle: I fully sympathize with the desire of the citizens of Brantford to have a memorial to the eminent inventor of the telephone. I shall hope to see it when again in Brantford, for I look back with pleasure to my last visit.

Earl of Minto: Hope that great success will crown your efforts to do honour to Professor Bell and his wonderful invention.

Earl Grey: The suggestion is a most excellent one, and will be glad to give it his hearty support.

Lord Strathcona: I fully enter into the spirit of the proposal for commemorating the invention of the telephone by Professor Graham Bell, and it would give me pleasure to have my name associated with it, and to aid in the matter to the best of my ability.

Sir W. Mortimer Clark: Expresses cordial approval of the scheme proposed.

Hon. J. P. Whitney: Already in Brantford you have appropriately commemorated in the Brant Memorial a historical fact in which Britons everywhere take great pride, viz.—the loyalty of the Six Nations to the British flag in the Revolutionary war. Your present enterprise is likewise of more than local interest, and we, as a people, have reason to congratulate ourselves that the first experiments with the telephone were made on Canadian soil near your thriving city.

Hon. Geo. W. Ross: I had the pleasure, perhaps I should say the honour, of speaking through the first long-distance telephone invented by Professor Bell, from his residence in the city of Brantford to his father's residence at Tutela Heights. I think it was in 1874. The telephone was regarded then as the production of a clever inventor calculated to interest the curious and novelty-loving people, but no one dreamed of its possibilities for commercial purposes. I think you are doing no more than is eminently proper to place on record your appreciation of the invention and the inventor in his connection as a resident of your beautiful city.

Hon. James Wilson, Secretary of Agriculture, U.S.A.: I am well acquainted with Dr. Bell, and am one of his admirers. I believe him to be one of the greatest scientists of the age, whose invention had done more to facilitate the spread of intelligence than that of any other man, living or dead. He is at this time absent from Washington, being at the University of Edinburgh, where he is to receive an honourary degree. I am pleased to see the Canadians taking this step towards honouring him. If there is anything I can do to facilitate the movement to honour him, I shall certainly be glad to do it.

Admiral Dewey: This project seems to me a very worthy one, and I gladly comply with your request that I permit the use of my name as one of the American patrons of the association.

John Joy Edson, Washington: In Washington, where Mr. Bell has resided for many years, the highest possible value is placed on his services rendered to the world as the inventor of the telephone.

Mr. Bell is esteemed also in Washington as a scholar and a great scientist and benefactor in many ways. Moreover, he is beloved by all in Washington who are fortunate in having enjoyed his personal acquaintance, and who have been his guests.

And last but not least I wish to place on record the appreciation of His Royal Highness the Prince of Wales, now King George the Fifth:

Ottawa, 13th September, 1904.

Sir:—

The application of the Bell Telephone Memorial Association as contained in your letter of the 27th June last for the patronage of His Royal Highness the Prince of Wales having been referred to the Governor General from the Colonial office, His Excellency was pleased to recommend it to the favourable consideration of His Royal Highness; and at the request of the Secretary of State for the Colonies, His Excellency now desires me to inform you that His Royal Highness is very glad to accede to the request of the association for his patronage.

I have the honour to be, Sir,

Your obedient servant,

C. J. Jones,

For the Governor General's Secretary.

W. F. Cockshutt, Esq., Chairman,
Bell Telephone Memorial Association,
Brantford, Ont.

From this you will see that the present King, then the Prince of Wales, became one of the patrons and we have as distinguished a list of persons as has ever extended their patronage to any memorial in the Dominion of Canada. The list is as follows:

Patrons:

His Royal Highness the Prince of Wales; His Excellency the Earl of Minto, Viceroy of India; His Excellency the Earl Grey, Governor General of Canada; the Rt. Hon. the Earl of Stamford, New England Company; the Hon. Sir W. Mortimer Clark, Lieutenant Governor of Ontario; the Hon. J. P. Whitney, Premier of Ontario; the Hon. Geo. W. Ross, Senator; Sir Thomas G. Shaughnessy, President of the Canadian Pacific Railway; Hon. Jas. Wilson, Secretary of Agriculture, U.S.A., Washington, D.C.; Hon. W. Murray Crane, Senator U.S.A., Washington, D.C.; John Joy Edson, Esq., Washington, D.C.; Hon. George Dewey, the Admiral of the Navy, U.S.A., Washington, D.C.; O. P. Letchworth, Esq., Buffalo, N.Y.

These are the names of the persons who have associated themselves with us and I am now pleased to inform this House and the country that the monument has been completed. It is a work of art second to none in Canada. I want to extend most heartily an invitation to all the members of this House and to all the senators, if they will come, and especially to members of the Government and the leader of the Opposition under whose auspices this vote was given, to come to the city of Brantford on the 24th October next and help us to

celebrate this epoch in the history of the city of Brantford and also commemorating the fact that Canada is the home of the invention of the telephone by Dr. Bell in 1874. Although Dr. Bell is a Scotchman by birth, his early days were spent in Canada and his father for upwards of twenty years was a resident here. I am sure that Canada will do itself honour in joining with us in celebrating this great event.

Mr. McKENZIE: I wish to say a word about the observations of my hon. friend from Brantford (Mr. Cockshutt). The gentleman to whom he refers is a constituent of mine and we are usually glad to claim anything that is coming to us by way of honour. I have had the pleasure of his personal acquaintance and I have been more than once the guest of the distinguished gentleman to whom my hon. friend from Brantford has referred. Dr. Bell and his good wife and family are well known and highly honoured in the county of Victoria. Dr. Bell is not only recognized in our part of the country as a great scientist but as a great man in every walk of life. He is a philanthropist of the first order and although now an American citizen, he, his wife, and family, have done everything they possibly could do in the promotion of every interest of the war since the war broke out. I have no doubt that although true to the country of his adoption, his heart fondly lingers with his old friends in Scotland, in England, and in that part of Canada which he now makes his home for the most part of the year. Dr. Bell has the distinction of being the inventor of the telephone. He has also had much to do with the progress of aviation in its early stages in this country. I had the good fortune seventeen or eighteen years ago of being in his laboratory at Bein Braigh, as he calls his place at Baddeck, when he was conducting his early experiments on the invention of the flying machine. Later on, when these experiments had been developed, we had the satisfaction in Baddeck of seeing a flying machine passing over the country giving a practical demonstration of the correctness of Dr. Bell's theories with regard to aviation. In his school started this young man, McCurdy, who has given great service to the country in connection with the war and who is giving great service now. It would be impossible in a short time to do justice to the history of this great man, Dr. Bell. I am glad indeed that the hon. member for Brantford has brought up the matter in the House in the way in which he has done, so that in a small way we may be able to do justice to the reputation of one of our greatest men and one who has conferred perhaps as much benefit upon the human race as any other man who has ever lived. I have much pleasure in associating myself with the hon. member for Brantford in everything he has said about the services, reputation, achievements, and life of the distinguished man about whom he has spoken.

Mr. SINCLAIR: Before we leave the Department of the Secretary of State, may I be permitted to ask him if there has been any relaxation of the rule about women crossing the Atlantic? Last May there was an embargo placed upon them sailing in passenger steamers and there have been a number of inquiries as to whether leave could be given to women who wanted to go across to Britain. I understand there is a rule but I do not understand how it is applied or whether it is universal or whether there are any grounds upon which an applicant may get leave to go.

Mr. MEIGHEN: The rule is very strict. I am not sure that I can precisely state it. There have to be very special reasons indeed to enable the authorities to permit a woman to cross the Atlantic. The British Government put in force a regulation to the effect that none can go except with the consent of the Canadian Government. I do not know if they stated to us just the reasons that would warrant us in giving consent but their great desire is that it be granted as rarely as possible and only in cases where real hardship would exist if it were refused. There has been no relaxation of the rule. What it was at first, it is the same now. My right hon. friend the Minister of Trade and Commerce (Sir George Foster) would be able to better state it than I because he has had more to do with the administration of it. But I might give an instance of the way the rule does apply. The British Government appointed a Toronto University professor—Professor McLennan—on the board of scientific research over there, a board similar to the one we have established here. It is a more or less permanent appointment, at all events, a war appointment, but under the rule which existed and which still exists, his wife was not given a passport to go. That is about as extreme a case as I know of. I thought it was quite an extraordinary thing. There has been no relaxation that I have heard of and I am satisfied there has been none at all.

Senate.

Travelling expenses of Senate members of the Parliamentary Committee appointed to consider the care, etc., of returned soldiers, $142.95; to provide an amount for the Speaker of the Senate in lieu of residence and attendants from January 18, 1917, to the close of the session, at the rate of $15 per diem, $3,345; to provide for the payment of the full sessional indemnity of a senator who died during the present session, $2,500.

Mr. CARVELL: So far as the first item is concerned, I presume that is all right. We know that the members were on the committee, and I have nothing to say. The second item seems fairly generous, but I shall not discuss it.

Mr. REID: This item is, of course, to compensate for the quarters which the Speaker formerly had.

Mr. CARVELL: Then there is a question about the third item, for a senator who died during the present session. I have been making inquiries about that, and I think that three senators have died during the session. As an act of justice, I should like to see the full sessional indemnity paid to the wife of the senator from New Brunswick, who died during this session.

Mr. SPEAKER: This is the usual item in such cases, and while I am unable to give details and names, I am quite sure that there is no possibility of there being any discrimination as between members of the Senate who died during the session. I understand that there is to be a further supplementary estimate, and I will undertake to get full information from the Senate so as to satisfy my hon. friend upon that point when the items are under consideration at a later stage.

With respect to the second item, which the hon. member for Carleton passed over lightly, the amount is very much larger this session than it would be in anything like a normal session. At the allowance of $15 per day in a normal session, this would come to a very much smaller amount because this item covers the period of recess. I intended to make reference to this in case we had any discussion upon a similar item in the estimates for this House. Even with the amount as it appears in the estimates of this year, I do not believe that from the monetary point of view it affords an equivalent to the Speaker for the loss to him of his quarters, and attendance, and the perquisites which obtained when we were in our old quarters in the Parliament Buildings. From another point of view it by no means affords a compensation, because members can hardly appreciate the worry upon the Speaker in quarters such as we have here, being constantly in attendance and with no conveniences, and having to change his clothing four times per day, besides losing a large amount of time going to and from the House during the recess periods.

Mr. LEMIEUX: Whatever garb he may wear the Speaker is always very genial, he is the highest type of a gentleman.

Mr. CARVELL: The question would be whether that bouquet was for our Speaker or the Speaker of the other House.

Mr. LEMIEUX: Oh, it is for our Speaker.

Mr. CARVELL: If it is for our Speaker, I wish to second it. But I think we were discussing the Speaker of the Senate. I shall be very glad if the Government or our Speaker will furnish me with details for which I have asked respecting the indemnities of deceased senators, because if the full indemnity be not paid to the family to whom I referred, it would be a great injustice, as compared to the treatment given to the families of deceased members of both Houses of Parliament in the past.

I do not know that we want to inject into this debate a question of policy, but I gathered from His Honour's remarks that he would be in favour of having the Speaker's quarters retained in the New House. There has been some discussion in the press and quite a lot of agitation in favour of abolishing the residence of the Speaker in both the Senate and the House of Commons. Never having occupied that high and honourable position, and not expecting to, I do not know much about it and have not much feeling for it. But, as no doubt, the interior arrangements in the new Parliament Buildings will be fairly well settled before Parliament meets again, it might be well if the Government or the committee who have charge of the re-erection of these buildings would take into consideration this very important question whether there are to be residences in the Parliament buildings for the Speakers. I am perhaps becoming old enough to support time-honoured customs unless they are shown to be based on error, and if there is room enough in the new buildings I am inclined to believe it would be as well to continue the residences.

Sir WILFRID LAURIER: I am older than my hon. friend. I have had forty years parliamentary experience, and I hope

that Mr. Speaker, whether for himself or his successors, will see that the new buildings have apartments for the Speakers. It would be most inconvenient, in my judgment, for the incumbent of that high office not to have his residence in the premises. When the House sits until five o'cclock in the morning it is most inconvenient for the Speaker to go to his lodgings outside of the House. Moreover, it is more convenient for him to have his office in the building, his lodging there, his family there. In my experience I never found any inconvenience arising from the custom; on the contrary, I found great convenience from the Speaker having his lodgings under the roof of the Parliament Buildings. It is the practice in England, and I should be sorry to depart from it. I do not know the views of the present Speaker, but I hope he will agree with me.

Mr. SCHAFFNER: I was going to suggest, as the matter is being discussed in the press and the country and also to some extent among the members, that it would be a good idea to get an expression of opinion upon this question from the present Speaker, and also from hon. gentlemen who who have been Speakers in the past.

It seems to me their opinion, as they know the conditions, would be better than the opinion of others. As I understood the remarks of the hon. leader of the Opposition, I think it would be a good thing to have the residence of the Speaker in the new House of Commons, unless there be some very serious objection. I rise to ask if the present Speaker would care to make any suggestion as to what he thought would be the proper arrangement.

Mr. SPEAKER: I am in thorough accord with the remarks of the right hon. leader of the Opposition and the hon. gentleman from Carleton, and I may say to the hon. gentleman from Souris that I am pleased to give my views upon this matter. I should think, from the point of view of the Speaker, it would be a very great hardship if there were no Speaker's house. I am a young man, and, I think, of average physical vigour, but I have felt the strain of the constant attendance, hour by hour, during the present session, and I am sure an older man would feel it in a very marked degree. The Speaker must change his clothing at the dinner hour, and when he comes to the House prior to the opening of the sitting, and when the House closes at night. That may not seem a very serious matter, but when you realize that you have to do that four times a day, and drive to an outside residence in all conditions of weather, it becomes somewhat tiresome and troublesome during the long sessions. There is the further fact that hon. gentlemen can get pairs upon all occasions, and go home to their families or to social engagements, but the Speaker is debarred from that, and must be always present.

There is another aspect which, I think, is of even greater importance; it is this: there is an atmosphere about the office of Speaker which I would be sorry to see this Parliament lose. There is a dignity and importance attached to the office in Great Britain which we, of course, cannot hope to attain in Canada, but which we should emulate. I am not referring to the social feature, but to the added dignity that lends itself to the office of Speaker when he has an official residence. There is also the circumstance that hon. gentlemen of varying shades of political opinion have the opportunity to foregather in the Speaker's house from time to time, which tends towards more pleasant and friendly relationship between the members, and as members thus come to know each other better, it, in my opinion, elevates the love of public life. My own view is—and I have given the matter very careful thought—that it would be a mistake to try to adjust the space in the new building to suit the requirements of the Speaker's House. In the first place, the ceilings are too high. It is doubtful if the partitions could be properly arranged to afford suitable accommodation. My view is that it would be a wise thing to erect an individual house for the Speaker on the edge of the cliff, which could be, while a separate house, joined with the main Parliament building by an arch-way or arcade of Gothic design in consonance with the building itself. By such a construction you would have all the advantages of an individual house for the Speaker. You would have convenient access to the Chamber. From an architectural viewpoint, it would add materially to the appearance of the buildings on the hill, because it is just a question whether, as the building now stands, it is not too rectangular. The Speaker's residence would break off, and rather improve, the perspective, looking at the hill from a distance. I have discussed this feature with Mr. Pearson, who is, of course, a very competent architect, and who has splendid artistic taste, and he is in thorough accord with my suggestion. It would cost more

to do this than to arrange quarters in the new building, but, as against that, you would have the added space in the new building, and, after all we are erecting buildings which ought to be suitable to the business of the Dominion for centuries. Bearing that in mind, it seems to me, for all it would cost to build a separate house for the Speaker, that that would be the ideal thing to do, and I sincerely hope that my suggestion in that respect will meet with the approval of hon. members.

To appoint Mr. M. F. Johnston to the Second Division, subdivision A, at $2,000 per annum, as reporter on the Committee Section of the Reporting Branch of the House of Commons, from September 1, 1917, $1,166.67.

Mr. SPEAKER: This is a case which the Civil Service Commission are entirely responsible for, and I may say, with all respect to that body, if they had seen their duty as I think they ought to have seen it, this item would not of necessity have appeared in the estimates at all. I might say in explanation that last session when the Senate re-organized its debates reporting staff, it was arranged that Mr. Johnston who had been one of the Senate reporters for 25 years, should be transferred to the Commons Committee reporting staff, to fill an existing vacancy. It was assumed that a certificate would be given by the Civil Service Commission. Mr. Shortt refused to issue a certificate but Mr. Larochelle wrote approving the appointment of Mr. Johnston on his fitness and qualification. The letter from Mr. Larochelle is attached.

Mr. Johnston was engaged for over two months this session reporting the committees of the Commons, and for nine weeks reporting the debates in the House, in both of which positions he gave satisfaction.

Recommendations as to Mr. Johnston's qualifications for the position on the committees staff were furnished by the editor of Hansard and the associate editor, and by the chief of the committee reporters, and Mr. Holland, late chief of the Senate reporting staff.

In their recommendation, the editors of Hansard state that Mr. Johnston's appointment "would be in the interest of efficiency in the service."

Mr. Johnston has been for many years official reporter in the Ontario courts, and has had wide experience in such work. The appointment is to fill a vacancy; it does not add to the establishment or the charge on the revenue. It was assumed that under section 21 of the Amended Civil Service Act the Civil Service Commission would grant the necessary certificate, but for reasons which I know not, they refused to do so. In a letter to the Clerk of this House, Mr. La Rochelle, the other member of the Civil Service Commission, writes:

Sir:—

In answer to your letter of the 25th instant, concerning the proposed appointment of Mr. Fiske Johnston to the Committee Reporting Branch of the House of Commons, I may say that I have carefully considered this matter, and that I believe this gentleman fully qualified to fill such a position.

The Civil Service Commission has been furnished with statements and testimonials from the heads of the reporting staffs of the Senate and the House of Commons, establishing that Mr. Johnston possesses to a high degree the qualifications required to efficiently fill the position to which it is proposed to appoint him, and, furthermore, that for more than twenty years he has been actually discharging with the utmost satisfaction duties similar to those attaching to the position in question.

It is true that, as a general rule, the Civil Service Commission issues certificates of qualification for positions in the inside service only after actual tests of qualification, but, on the other hand, section 21 of the Amended Civil Service Act (1908) provides that in certain cases of a professional, technical or peculiar character, where it is satisfied that a person recommended for appointment is fully qualified, such examination may be dispensed with. And I am to state that in my opinion the present case is clearly one where an examination may be dispensed with and that the certificate required for the appointment of Mr. Johnston may very properly be granted by the Civil Service Commission.

You will understand, of course, that my opinion is not shared by my colleague and that as a result of our disagreement no certificate can legally issue under the law.

This is a case in which, if we did not take this action, a very grave injustice would be done to a very competent official of this House, and, under the circumstances, I am quite sure the committee will pass the item.

Mr. LEMIEUX: There is a deadlock.

Mr. SPEAKER: Yes.

Mr. MARCIL: The Government provided some years ago for the appointment of a third member of the Civil Service Commission. If that appointment had been made this deadlock would have been avoided.

Mr. SPEAKER: I quite agree with the hon. member for Bonaventure, but that is a subject over which I have no control.

Mr. LEMIEUX: As we are speaking of the debates—and Mr. Johnston belongs to the Debates Branch—

Mr. SPEAKER: The Committee Reporting staff.

Mr. LEMIEUX: I might, perhaps, here interject a few remarks about the French translation of Hansard. There has been a

marked improvement in the management of the French translation staff. The committee will remember that some years ago I and the hon. member for Bonaventure and a few others who took a deep interest in having a proper translation brought the matter before the House, and changes were made, but, unfortunately, the Speaker who then occupied the Chair did not seem anxious to meet our views. In fact, he followed his own inclination, and as he had, I suppose, no great sympathy for the French translation, matters went from bad to worse. I am bound to say, however, that since the appointment of Mr. Leon Gérin as head of the French staff, we have had excellent translation of Hansard. At the same time, we have had the French Hansard distributed to members practically at the same time as the English version, with, perhaps, a few hours or a day between. A little delay does not matter, however, provided we have a good translation. My hon. frfiend the Speaker will realize that Hansard is sent to public Libraries in Europe, to countries such as France, Belgium, Switzerland and even Italy. In Europe, the people who have to consult our debates will naturally read the French version, because they are more familiar with the French language than with the English. We, who profess to have some love for the French language and who are interested in the culture of it, are rather jealous of that translation. Mr. Leon Gérin is a well-known litterateur, and he has had a long experience in the departments before becoming head of the French translation staff. For many years he was the secretary of the Hon. Sir A. R. Angers when he was Minister of Agriculture, and as a technical translator he has possibly no superior in the country. He has, on one or two occasions, been the President of the French Section of the Royal Society, and he is one of the French Canadian writers best known outside of Canada. In fact he very often writes in reviews published in France. But there is always a fly in the ointment. My hon. friend the Speaker will realize that the head of a staff should be protected against the intrigues of his subordinates. The orders which he gives and the discipline which he must exercise in his department should be sanctioned, and it should be the duty of both the Speaker and the Clerk of the House to see that that authority is maintained. It is so easy with translators, who generally have served in journalism, to take liberties with discipline, that it would be a pity if that staff, which has been so well reorganized, should lose its strength. I do not make any charge or accusation against any one, but it has happened that one member of that staff, whom I will not name, has simply discarded the authority of Mr. Gérin. I know Mr. Gérin well. I beg the Speaker of the House to see that his authority is respected, because the moment there is a flaw in the management of that office, it will go to pieces as it did a few years ago. As it is organized to-day, it is as near perfection as possible. I want the protection of the Speaker and of the Clerk of the House, both eminent gentlemen and men who value discipline, to see that Mr. Gérin's authority is respected within his own department.

Mr. SPEAKER: I am very glad to hear the words of commendation from the hon. member for Rouville. I cannot speak from my own knowledge as to the value of the work of the translators, but I know the opinion generally expressed is that this work, in the past has not been done as well as it ought to have been done, and while some improvement has been made, there is room for greater improvement still. So far as my ability permits, I shall be only too glad to render every effort to that end. On the point the hon. member has raised as to the authority of one in charge of a branch, my experience in the business world before I had any experience in politics has taught me that it is an axiom of successful business management that you must give your foreman complete charge in the sphere of his duties, and that you must back him up while he is in authority. If it comes to a point of conflict between your foreman and those who are under him, you must choose as between your foreman and those who are under him, and it simply means that either the foreman remains, or his usefulness is done and he must go. So far as Mr. Gérin is concerned, his services have been eminently satisfactory. While I happen to be Speaker he will always receive from me full sympathy and support along the lines I have suggested.

Mr. LEMIEUX: Might I ask if anything has been done towards helping the elevator men in the building? My hon. friend has been very kind to the messengers, but the elevator men are after us nearly every day. They give us a lift, and they think we ought to give them a lift in their salaries. Of course, we have no influence with the Government, but I thought I would bring

to my hon. friend's attention the fact that these men are appealing to us. Remember also that the high cost of living pinches the poor man more than the rich.

Mr. SPEAKER: This matter has not been brought to my attention before. I think these men come under the Public Works Department.

Mr. LEMIEUX: But the Speaker is their spokesman.

Mr. SPEAKER: I will make inquiries about the matter.

Mr. LEMIEUX: And about the messengers too.

Mr. SPEAKER: Yes.

To appoint Miss M. J. Barton to Third Division, Subdivision A, at $1,000 per annum as a clerk in the Law Branch, $1,000.

Mr. SPEAKER: I object as much as any member of the House to promoting officials by Act of Parliament as against the Civil Service Commission, but there are certain cases where a grave injustice would be done if a special vote were not arranged for. I cited a case only a moment ago, and I have now before me the case of Miss Barton, whom it is proposed to appoint to subdivision A at a salary of $1,000, as a clerk in the Law Branch. I cannot put the case better than by reading a memorandum prepared on the subject by Mr. Gisborne, the Parliamentary Counsel:

Miss Marietta Barton passed the Civil Service examination under the law in force before the amending Act of 1908 and came first in the examination at which she passed. She was first employed on the House of Commons staff in 1908, and since that time was employed during the sessions on the House of Commons staff, and during the recess in various departments. I was appointed Parliamentary Counsel in the autumn of 1913, and Miss Barton came to my staff as my secretary in July, 1914, and she has been continuously employed in that position ever since. She is not only able to do my shorthand and other clerical work, but is also able skilfully and intelligently to look after the large amount of legal drafting that I have to do, as well as other legal work in the office. Unfortunately, she is now past the age at which she can go up for examination under the new law, but, under the peculiar circumstances of the case, I would ask that her name be put in the Supplementary Estimates as a clerk in grade 3a, at a salary of $1,000. She has been receiving pay at the rate of $900 for some years past. I would point out that I have, since my appointment, dropped two clerkships from my branch, one at $2,000, which was then vacant, and one at $1,400 caused by the death in action of the late Mr. John L. Godwin, so that the appointment would not involve any enlargement of the organization of the branch. I am particularly anxious to have this proposal carried out, as Miss Barton is now only on the temporary staff and her loss would be a serious blow to the efficiency of my office.

(Sgd.) Francis H. Gisborne.

I can bear testimony to the ability, efficiency and industry of the Parliamentary Counsel, and in view of his representations I felt it my duty to ask that this vote be included in the estimates.

Mr. CARVELL: The Speaker states that this lady has reached an age where she cannot appear before the Civil Service Commission for examination. Would a similar vote to this have to be taken every year for this appointment?

Mr. SPEAKER: I understand that this makes her a permanent official, and that from now on she will be in the same position in all respects as if she had been placed in the same grade by the Civil Service Commission.

Mr. CARVELL: Then she is appointed to the position by Act of Parliament?

Mr. SPEAKER: That is what it amounts to.

Mr. CARVELL: Once she is appointed by Act of Parliament, is her status any different from that of a clerk appointed by the Civil Service Commission?

Mr. SPEAKER: They are in precisely the same position, I understand.

To provide a service of stenography and typewriting for the use of members—further amount required, $15,000.

Mr. PUGSLEY: I would call the attention of His Honour and that of the committee to the fact that $25,000 was voted in the main estimates for this purpose, and now an amount of $15,000 is being asked for, which makes $40,000 altogether. How many employees come under this head, and what is the salary paid to each?

Mr. SPEAKER: I regret I cannot give exact information at the moment, as some of my papers have become misplaced, but speaking from memory, I think there are, at the present time, 42 stenographers for the use of members. The salaries vary slightly, but in the main the stenographers get $75 a month during the session. If the hon. member desires exact information on this point, I shall be very happy to send it to him in the course of the day.

Mr. PUGSLEY: The reason I ask is that I think it is worthy of consideration whether or not there should be a change in the system. I am speaking of my own individual case, and my remarks may not have any weight with other members. I occupy a

room with three other ex-ministers, and I do not find it at all convenient to have my work done by a member of the stenographic staff. I find it much more convenient to employ a private stenographer, whom I have to pay for the work I have done. I really think it would be very much better if an allowance, nothing like $1,000 per annum or $75 per month, but something like $400 per annum, was made to the members, and let them arrange for their own secretarial work. There is another objection. Many members have private correspondence to attend to, and for that reason it would be much more satisfactory to have their own stenographers. I throw out this suggestion for the consideration of hon. members. I had the opportunity some time ago of speaking with His Honour on this subject, which I think is well worthy of consideration. The amount which is paid out, $40,000, is very large, and I really think that half of this amount allowed to the members would enable them to get their stenographic work done much more satisfactorily than under the present system. I do not wish to make any reflection upon the work which the stenographers have done. I think they are very competent and that their work is satisfactory, but in my own case the system is not satisfactory. I do not know whether other hon. members agree with me or not.

Mr. SPEAKER: I give only my own views, of course, because, after all, the arrangement, whatever it is, has to be determined by the House of Commons. I may say that my views are entirely in accord with those expressed by the hon. member from St. John. When I was a private member of the House, before any arrangement was made, I always had my own stenographer here. I followed this practice until I was appointed Deputy Speaker. From almost every point of view, it would be more desirable if an allowance could be made so that each member might make his own arrangements. He would get better work done and would have the services of one stenographer who would become familiar with his methods. He would also have the advantage of his correspondence being kept in the strictest confidence.

Mr. EDWARDS: In voting a sum of money for stenographers, this House is accepting the principle that it is right to pay for such service to carry on the political correspondence of the members. That seems to me to be reasonable, but there is no doubt in my mind that under the present arrangement the money is being used to pay stenographers to do a lot of private business for members. We might assume that each member would have about the same amount of political correspondence—that is not exactly true, but we may go on that assumption, and therefore we might make an allowance to each member to cover his political correspondence. Some of the members of this House carry on very extensive businesses, and I quite understand they might require more stenographic services than other members. I would be very strong'y disposed to endorse the suggestion made by the hon. member for St. John. As it is now, some members of the House are having more money paid out in their interests than others. We are all on the same basis so far as concerns the principle of paying for the carrying on of our necessary political correspondence. I think it is reasonable that a certain allowance should be made to each member, and let him supplement it if necessary, to get a stenographer who would attend to his business.

Mr. CARVELL: I entirely agree with the remarks of the hon. member for Frontenac. I believe I must plead guilty to being one of those who have employed a stenographer for private affairs to a much greater extent than for political affairs, because my political correspondence has always been very meagre, indeed, and it is practically nil at the present time. I have nothing but the highest praise for the manner in which the present system has worked out. The officials who have charge of it are exceedingly courteous, and do everything they can to meet the convenience of the different members, at least they do in my case. The members of the staff are also very courteous and attentive to their duties. I have had one stenographer who is a real artist, and whenever he is available I can almost take the responsibility of signing a letter without reading it over. Being a first-class stenographer, however, he is greatly in demand, and it often happens I cannot get him. I find when I dictate a letter containing some legal expression, or some technical term, or somethhing out of the ordinary run of correspondence, to a young lady who has had no previous experience in that line, naturally she brings back the work in a most unsatisfactory condition. I cannot find any fault with her, because she has not had the experience or training in legal matters. If this amount of $40,000 were divided among the two

hundred odd members, it would allow about $200 each, which would be ample for a member who wished stenographic work done. If he had more work than that to have done, he should certainly pay for it himself. I believe there are many members of this House who would be perfectly willing to take this $200, and supplement it by whatever sum might be necessary, and provide their own stenographers, because in that way we would get much more satisfactory service than we are receiving at the present time. I wish to call the attention of the House to the last item, which may be a personal matter to some extent, but perhaps we might just as well have it explained. Perhaps the Speaker will tell us on what principle that item is made up. Of course, I understand there is one item of $2,500 for Hon. Dr. Beland with which every one will agree, but I would like to know on what principle the rest is made up.

Mr. REID: The last item reads:

To provide payment of the full sessional indemnity of members of the House of Commons —days lost through absence caused by illness, public business, being engaged in necessary farming operations, or on account of death, during the present session, including an amount of $2,500 to Hon. H. S. Béland, a prisoner of war in Germany, notwithstanding anything to the contrary in Chapter 10 of the Revised Statutes, an Act respecting the Senate and House of Commons or any amendments thereto—payment to be made as the Treasury Board may direct, $22,010.

It is stated in the Act that members are entitled to fifteen days' absence without deduction from their sessional indemnity. If they are absent more than fifteen days it is deducted from the indemnity. The item explains itself to the extent that it is to pay members of the House of Commons who have lost days through absence caused by illness. We have some members who have been ill. I might mention the hon. member for Dundas (Mr. Broder) and the hon. member from Essex North (Mr. Wilcox) and the hon. member for Joliette (Mr. Guilbault) as being some hon. members whose names occur to me at the moment. Then, ministers and others may be absent on account of public business. It is also to provide funds to pay for days lost through absence on account of members being engaged in necessary farming operations.

Mr. CARVELL: I am a farmer, and I was just wondering whether I would come under that.

Mr. REID: About the month of May, the two Whips stated there were a number of men engaged in farming, mostly in the West, who wished to remain at home to put in their crops and look after their farming interests. It was understood that these men would be allowed an additional fifteen days. It was understood that those members who were actively engaged in farming would be allowed an additional fifteen days. That is the reason the item is worded in that way. Then, the other is on account of a death during the session. There is another matter that I might mention. We have had a long session, and it has been suggested by the Whips that fifteen days ought to be allowed in addition to the fifteen days that the statute allows.

Mr. CARVELL: That would be general?

Mr. REID: That would be general. It is under the consideration of the Minister of Finance.

Mr. CARVELL: I would be much more in sympathy with the latter proposition than I would be with the proposition as it now stands in the supplementary estimates. I have not been entirely in sympathy with the idea that a member is a school boy and that he will receive pay, or fail to receive pay, according to his attendance. A man who is elected to Parliament must answer to his constituents, and if he does not attend the session and perform his duties, in all probability his constituents will settle with him when he goes back to them again. You allow a man fifteen days absence, and then, if he is absent beyond that, you deduct, I think, $15 a day. A deduction is generally made in my case, because I am away more than fifteen days during the session. Yet, I do not think I could be blamed very much if I said that probably I devoted as much time to the public interest as any other member of the House of Commons. If I am absent more than 15 days, I simply have to lose the amount that is deducted. For a number of years the custom has grown up by which members are allowed a certain amount of leeway on account of illness. I have known of men receiving some benefit from that provision in recent years that I thought was very shady indeed. I could hardly believe that it was a case of illness to the extent to which it has been taken advantage of.

Sir WILFRID LAURIER: Parliamentary illness.

Mr. CARVELL: Parliamentary illness, as my leader says. Now, we come to the question of farming. I do not know why the man who is away on account of being a farmer should be placed in a different

position from the man who is away because he is a lawyer. If I have courts going on, I must attend them, in doing so I am attending to my private business, and when a farmer is away he is away attending to his private business. I cannot see much reason in making this allowance, and I think he should be charged for the time he is away like the rest of us. I am heartily in agreement with the proposition that on account of the length of the session the Government might properly allow an extension of fifteen days. I have always felt that special extensions are unfair and discriminating.

Mr. REID: On account of the great shortage of labour in the West this year these members had to go away, and that is why this allowance is made. But the estimate brought down to provide for an additional fifteen days' allowance will be a general one, and we will all be on the same footing.

Mr. NESBITT: I have sympathy with the Government in the extension of fifteen days to those who have had to go West to attend to their farming work, although, as my hon. friend from Carleton (Mr. Carvell) says, there should not be any exceptions. Each man thinks his business is just as important as the other man's. But, this year, on account of the great shortage of labour, I think it is quite excusable. I am thoroughly in accord with the proposition to extend the time of all members on account of the length of the session. But, I am not in accord with the idea of paying members who shirk their duty, who do not pretend to be here during the session, who only come once in a while when a vote or something of that kind is on, and neglect their duties for the rest of the session.

Department of Public Archives—To provide for the salary of the chairman of Publication Committee, $5,000; to provide for one clerkship in Second Division, Subdivision A, $1,600—$6,600.

Mr. PUGSLEY: Is that new?

Mr. REID: Yes.

Mr. PUGSLEY: An explanation should be given of it.

Mr. MEIGHEN: In the year 1907 the Government published the first series of volumes relating to the constitutional history of Canada. The second volume, along the same line of work, was published in 1912. On account of the demand for the work, which came to be used in universities and schools as a text-book, in 1914 the Government undertook to republish both books, the previous editions having proved insufficient. Leading jurists were among those who made strong requests for the republication. Having issued these volumes, the Government considered the question of issuing collections of documents covering other important fields of Canadian development, including the treatment of the industrial and agricultural growth of the country. That is the purpose of this vote. The purpose of this vote is to provide for superintending the production of these works.

Mr. PUGSLEY: Is there a chairman?

Mr. MEIGHEN: There is to be. There has been none selected as yet. The item was in when I came to the department. It is to provide for one chairman and one assistant, the chairman at $5,000 and the assistant at $1,600. They are to be known as the Publication Committee, and their duties are to collect and edit a series of publications following on from what has been done with the subject of the constitutional development of Canada, and commencing at the beginning with regard to the agricultural and industrial development. I am not sure that I am giving an explanation that is anything more than indicative to the committee. The work, however, is not new. It is merely a matter of putting it on a systematic basis, and making some one competent responsible for its success.

Mr. CARVELL: Has the assistant been chosen yet?

Mr. MEIGHEN: I have not even heard the suggestion of the name of an assistant. I have heard a name mentioned for the chairmanship, but I am not at liberty to mention it.

Mr. CARVELL: I presume that the assistant would have to be chosen by the Civil Service Commission.

Mr. MEIGHEN: Oh, yes.

Mr. CARVELL: What about the chairman? Would he be in the same position?

Mr. MEIGHEN: No, I do not think so. It would be unreasonable, a technical position—

Mr. CARVELL: I thought possibly there might have been some decision as to this point. A couple of months ago a lady spoke to me about a position something like this, not asking me to assist her in obtaining a position, as she knew I had no influence with the Government, but rather complain-

ing bitterly that the Civil Service Commission had refused to consider her application for a position having to do with the Archives, and I assume it must have been this position, on the ground that about 160 or 170 years ago an ancestor of hers, in his official capacity, had played a part that had not been very friendly to certain people who lived in what is Canada at the present time. I thought if that were true, it was drawing the line very fine indeed, to cast upon this party a burden which she should not be called upon to bear.

Mr. MEIGHEN: Visiting the sins of the father—

Mr. CARVELL: Not the father, the great, great, great, grandfather, because it goes back about 160 years. I shall give the name to the minister in confidence. I was given to understand that the Chairman of the Civil Service Commission pointed out to the lady that, on account of what had taken place in the case of one of her ancestors a century and a half ago, she might possibly not be persona grata.

Mr. MEIGHEN: I shall make a note of this, and so far as it is in my power no lady will suffer because her great grandfather committed any crime whatever.

Mr. CARVELL: Oh no, it was not a crime; he was a very high public official at that time, and carried out probably a very unpleasant duty.

Mr. SINCLAIR: I scarcely understand the necessity for this board. It would seem to me that the archivist would be the best judge of what should be published. If it is simply to deal with the question of what shall be published, I should like to know why we should have a distinct and separate board of officials for that purpose.

Mr. MEIGHEN: The archivist is merely a collector. If Canada is to have her industrial and her agricultural as well as her constitutional records properly kept and edited, the archivist is not a man of standing to do that. I know that if hon. gentlemen heard the name of the man—

Mr. MARCIL: Is he a cabinet minister?

Mr. MEIGHEN: No, I do not know of any cabinet minister who is anxious—

Mr. MARCIL: We were told that some were going out after the session to make room for new ones.

Mr. REID: That is a false story.

[Mr. Carvell.]

Mr. MEIGHEN: If I were competent I should like to undertake the work. I am sure hon. gentlemen opposite will agree that the party contemplated will be in a distinguished sense competent to do the work.

Mr. PUGSLEY: It seems to me the Government ought to hesitate about adding this office to the archives branch, especially when that branch is at the present time costing more than $60,000 a year, as will be seen from the list of officials in the main estimates, and the vote for contingencies. Now it is proposed to create another office and to attach a salary of $5,000 a year, together with assistants. I do not think this is the time for such an undertaking. These publications might very well stand over for a while. I suggest that for the consideration of the minister.

Mr. MEIGHEN: I have no doubt there is some extra expense in the archives owing to the extra efforts that have to be made now in connection with records for the war. Mr. Doughty went over to England and France a year and a half or two years ago and has spent most of that time over there in the pursuit of duties that peculiarly appertain to his office and that were quite necessary.

Mr. PUGSLEY: He is an exceedingly good man.

Mr. MEIGHEN: He urged very strongly that this opportunity should not be lost as the work could never be overtaken in the future. That may account for some of the expense, if there is an increase. This work is of a permanent character and if it is worth doing it is worth doing well. Literature that is not good literature is not worth producing.

Mr. MARCIL: Are these publications issued in the two languages?

Mr. MEIGHEN: Both languages.

At six o'clock the committee took recess.

After Recess.

The committee resumed at eight o'clock.

To defray the expenses of the Economic Development Commission, including an amount of $750 payable to Mr. E. H. Godfrey of the Census Branch, for services as editor of the commission, $3,750.

Mr. LEMIEUX: Is that a new office?

Mr. REID: No, that is the Economic Development Commission. It is just being wound up.

Mr. OLIVER: Has this item been under discussion at all? What has happened in connection with this commission?

Mr. REID: So far as this commission is concerned there has not been very much done during the last year. This commission is composed of Sir James Lougheed, chairman; Senator Ross; J. B. Roland, Montreal; W. R. Dobell, Quebec; Mr. Farrell, British Columbia. Sir Joseph Flavelle was on the commission for a while. Mr. Watters and a gentleman from Moosejaw, president, I think, of the Grain Growers, were on the commission?

Mr. LEMIEUX: Will the hon. gentleman explain the objects of the commission?

Mr. REID: I have not followed it up. The assistant secretary was receiving a salary of $100 or $125 per month, and they have had a little printing to do in winding up. Sir James Lougheed intends to have the commission wound up shortly after the close of the session. The commissioners are working gratuitously, but their expenses are paid. They have reports ready, and these reports have been audited by Mr. Godfrey, who was paid $750 for that work. This amount is intended to pay the expenses of the commissioners and the assistant secretary's salary.

Mr. LEMIEUX: I am not objecting to the amount, if the hon. gentleman will explain the object of the commission. Later on, perhaps, the minister can give us an explanation.

Mr. REID: I will give an explanation later.

Mr. LEMIEUX: I am glad that the Government have appointed Mr. Roland, a very well known paper manufacturer at St. Jerome, who stands very high in the industrial world. I wish to express regret that the hon. Minister of Trade and Commerce has not seen fit to appoint a gentleman from Quebec to a position on the Scientific Research Commission. The minister said the other day that he did not know any person from Laval who was competent to serve on the commission. I can assure him and the committee that there are several very eminent professors at Laval who could fill one of these positions. I hope that when there is a vacancy on the board a professor from Laval will be appointed.

Mr. OLIVER: When the minister obtains the further information, will he include in the memorandum the date of the appointment of the commission, the date at which it is expected the organization will be terminated, and the amount of money that the commission has cost, or will have cost, between those two dates?

Mr. REID: Yes.

Mr. LEMIEUX: I forgot to state, in answer to the statement by the Minister of Trade and Commerce the other day, that some years ago, when the World's Congress of Geology was held at St. Petersburg, the only scientist representing Canada was the late Monseigneur Laflamme of Laval University, who was a well-known authority in geology and other sciences. He has left some successors to follow in his footsteps. Some years ago, when I was in Japan, visiting the University of Tokio, where there are, as my hon. friend knows, very eminent scientists, I found that the name of Monseigneur Laflamme was the only Canadian name known to that distant country. I make this statement to show that Laval could be of service to the country through some of its well-known professors. I hope my hon. friend will revise the unjust and biased view taken by his colleague the Minister of Trade and Commerce.

To provide for the expenses of the Conservation Commission, $4,000.

Mr. LEMIEUX: Is that the commission headed by Sir Clifford Sifton?

Mr. REID: Yes.

Mr. LEMIEUX: I notice that Sir Clifford Sifton is very busy conserving other things than the national resources of the country. He is trying to conserve the good things for the Tory party. Perhaps, if his activities are so much needed in that conservation process, his services might be passed over to the Tory party for good, and a less obnoxious gentleman might be appointed at the head of the Conservation Commission.

Mr. OLIVER: Does the work of this commission include any construction or manufacture of any kind?

Mr. REID: A report of their whole work during the year has been laid on the Table. I have not read the report this year, but it gives a full explanation of the work done.

Mr. OLIVER: I wondered if, included in the work of this commission under its distinguished head, there was anything devoted to cabinet making.

Mr. REID: No, nothing of that kind.

Mr. LEMIEUX: Does the Conservation Commission not make a report?

Mr. REID: Yes, the report has been laid on the table of the House; it is very extensive.

Mr. LEMIEUX: I know that we receive from the commission weekly sheets which are interesting, and the annual report is interesting also. I am anxious to know if there is a report made in regard to expenditure.

Mr. REID: The expenditure is all given in the Auditor General's report.

Mr. OLIVER: This is a supplementary estimate. About what will be the total expenses of the Conservation Commission for the year? What was the total expenditure for last year?

Mr. REID: I have not that here.

Civil government—Department of Justice, including penitentiary branch, $5,475.

Mr. LEMIEUX: While we are on the item of penitentiaries, and as the session is coming to a close, will the minister give the committee the information concerning Thomas Kelly? The other day the Solicitor General stated that he would bring down the papers, but I have not seen them so far. I have read in the Toronto Telegram an item which deos not tally with tne information given by the minister to the House. I am not saying that I do not accept the statement made by the minister, but the item in the Toronto Telegram differs radically from his statement. The item was published the second day after the release of Kelly. Possibly the minister saw it in the press.

Mr. DOHERTY: I did not see it.

Mr. LEMIEUX: The Toronto Telegram, in a despatch from Winnipeg, expressed surprise that Kelly had been released. It stated that, as a matter of fact, he had received special treatment since he had been detained in the penitentiary; that he did not, for one thing, receive the hair cut; that he did not wear the garb of a convict, and that he was immediately sent to the hospital ward. That means favourable treatment for any prisoner, unless, of course, he is, as the minister states, sick. Later on, after some pressure was brought to bear upon the department by way of petitions, letters, telegrams and doctors' certificates, he was sent to a hospital outside of the the penitentiary. This is the point I wish to emphasize. According to the despatch—I am referring to what the correspondant of the Toronto Telegram states—Kelly apparently was not sent to any hospital, but was sent home, which, after all, is the best hospital. The first news that he was released was that he was seen in his house by people passing along the street. I cannot for one moment believe that any favour was shown by the minister to a prisoner found guilty of such a crime as Kelly had committed. I believe what the minister says, namely, that Kelly was really a very sick person, and in danger of losing his liberty for good, that is to say, his life. For the sake, however, of the minister's reputation, in view of the statement made by a paper which supports the Conservative party, he might, perhaps, give an explanation in regard to the matter.

Mr. DOHERTY: I shall be very willing to do so. I am surprised that any statement that Kelly was treated differently from the manner in which any other prisoner in the same condition of health was treated, should have been published. There has already been laid upon the table the correspondence with regard to the manner in which Kelly was treated during his detention in the penitentiary.

Mr. LEMIEUX: That was some months ago.

Mr. DOHERTY: Yes. We are on the question now as to his treatment in the penitentiary. I may summarize the matter very briefly. When Kelly arrived at the penitentiary the penitentiary surgeon, in the performance of what he conceived to be his duty, communicated to the department the fact that in his opinion—the committee, of course, will understand that I do not purport to give his exact words—the prisoner was suffering from nervous breakdown, which placed him on the verge of insanity. I do not say that he used the word "insanity," but he did say that the prisoner was in a most critical condition, and asked that he might be permitted to call in another doctor in consultation, Mr. Kelly, or his family, being willing to pay the expense of that consultation. I do not think that was a very material feature in the matter. Permission was, of course, given when the surgeon asked for it. The doctor called in consultation was Dr. Carscallon, of Winnipeg, a gentleman of standing and reputation, I am informed, and the head of an institution in which nervous diseases are treated. Dr. Carscallon, in consultation with the penitentiary surgeon, Dr. McGuire, who, I regret to say, has since died, reported at that time in very strong

terms that he was exceedingly apprehensive that, if Kelly were not released, the consequence would be very grave; that he was in an extreme condition of nervous breakdown, and that he had, as Dr. Carscallon had ascertained, been some ten years ago treated for a similar attack which had been exceedingly grave. The doctor's conclusion was that Kelly ought then to be released. In this condition of affairs, as it was represented that there was apprehension that continual confinement would produce those serious results, I thought it proper that before action there should be at least be some opportunity to see whether those apprehensions would be fulfilled. I waited a little while. In the meantime the facts had been reported to us that Kelly was under the surgeon's care, and that he had not had his hair cut nor been put into the ordinary garb because of the opinion of the surgeon that in his then condition any such action would precipitate the consequences that he apprehended. The matter stood for some little time. I caused inquiry to be made from the surgeon as to whether Kelly's condition was yet such that he might alter the treatment. Not only did he report to me again that Kelly's condition was not such, but he persisted in his view that it was a matter of grave danger to retain the man in the penitentiary at all. Thereupon, because I realized the gravity of the offence of which this man had been found guilty and the great importance of not allowing it to be suggested that because of any position of his, financial or otherwise, there would be any action taken that the circumstances did not actually call for, I caused him to be examined by Dr. Lafleur of Montreal, whom the hon. gentleman no doubt knows to be one of the leading physicians not only in our province, but I think I may safely say, in the whole Dominion. Dr. Lafleur reported that Kelly had certain physical symptoms, that he was very much affected, but in his opinion there was not any nervous condition that might not be accounted for by the circumstances in which Kelly found himself. He did not think that in the condition in which Kelly was there was reason to apprehend that further confinement would bring about serious results. As to Kelly's nervous condition, it was quite impossible for him to form any serious opinion. That was some time in April. In view of that report, and notwithstanding the report of the jail surgeon and of Dr. Carscallon, I felt I would not be justified in ordering Kelly's release. But I did have further communication with the penitentiary surgeon as to the possibility of altering the system under which Kelly was dealt with. The penitentiary surgeon again reported to me that he would not take the responsibility of that being done. We must conduct these institutions, so far as the health of their inmates and the treatment they are to receive is concerned, in accordance with the advice of the surgeon, and what was done in Kelly's case would have been done in the case of any other prisoner in regard to whom the surgeon had made a similar report. Conditions remained the same until some time in June—I am speaking from memory, and do not recall the precise date—when we again made inquiry, with the same results so far as the penitentiary surgeon was concerned. The conditions remained the same until a date in the month of August which I do not precisely recall. In the meantime we had the most pitiful representations from Kelly's friends in regard to his condition of health. Whether they were well founded or not, I think that any gentleman who heard the story as it was told to me would at all events have had implicit confidence in the sincerity of those who told it. However that may be, in the month of August, on a date I cannot recall at the present moment, I received a message to the effect that Kelly was exceedingly ill, and that the warden had sent for the members of his family to come and see him. The next day, I think, there was communicated to me the report of Dr. Miner, who had been called in by the family, and he described Kelly's conditions as most serious. He intimated that he was not prepared to define precisely what the trouble was, but described Kelly as being in a most precarious condition. Under those circumstances, I caused Kelly to be visited and examined by Dr. E. R. Popham, of Winnipeg, a gentleman who, I ascertained by inquiries from people absolutely disinterested in Kelly in every way, was an outstanding physician of eminent professional capacity and unquestioned integrity. I asked him to report to me on Kelly's condition, and to give me his opinion as to the consequences if Kelly was retained in confinement in the condition in which he was. He reported that Kelly was suffering from an attack of gastritis, and he gave his temperature, which was very high. He said that he was rapidly losing strength, and that in the condition in which he was, there was no reason to expect any improvement. I felt that there was no course open

to me but to act on that report, confirmatory as it was of the other reports that had been coming to me, which were based upon a condition which had supervened several months after the examination by Dr. Lafleur. Thereupon, I did advise His Excellency the Governor General that it was a proper case for the issue of a ticket-of-leave, for the purpose of having the patient transferred to a hospital where he would receive proper treatment. That was what I understood was considered the best course. I did learn subsequently that when the prisoner was liberated for that purpose he was taken to his own home instead of being taken to a hospital. Upon that I had Dr. Popham visit him again to ascertain whether he was in a better condition of health, and whether it would be possible to move him, if desirable, to a hospital. He reported that he was not in a better condition of health, but that it would be possible to remove him to a hospital. Under the circumstances I could not see that there was anything to be gained by ordering him transferred to a hospital. We should have no greater control over him there than in his own home. He was on ticket-of-leave, and the order that he should be liberated for the purpose of being transferred to a hospital had been made, not because we supposed we would have greater control over him in a hospital, but because our impression was that that was what was desired. Upon the last report Kelly is still a very sick man, under the care of his doctor in his own home. What may be the proper course if he should recover will, of course, be a matter for consideration. For the present I regret not having brought down all the papers that bear upon Kelly's condition of health. As I have already said, the papers that bear upon the reasons for the treatment he received are already before the House, and I shall be glad to bring down the other communications with regard to his health to-morrow. I have no hesitation in saying that on the evidence before me I am convinced that I could not have acted otherwise than I have done.

Of course, it has no bearing on the release of Kelly, but it is only fair to him to state this fact. He was convicted of an offence for which the maximum sentence is three years. He was sentenced to two and a half years, and had served nine months of that sentence, but he had been in custody awaiting extradition, and in jail at Winnipeg, from the month of October, 1915, to the month of November, 1916, when he was taken to the penitentiary. He then spent nine months in the penitentiary, so that altogether he has been in close custody in the jail and penitentiary for a period of twenty-one months for an offence for which the maximum sentence is three years. In all fairness to Kelly it is proper to point out that, while he was charged with different offences, yet, under the judgment both of the Court of Appeals in Manitoba and the unanimous judgment of the Supreme Court of Canada, he could properly be found guilty of but the one offence of obtaining money under false pretenses.

Of course, I do not want to say that was a matter that had a bearing on his release under the circumstnaces. He was released solely in view of his physical condition. I think it is fair to point out these other circumstances because it is well for the public to know the extent to which this man had actually received punishment.

Mr. LEMIEUX: We are reviving an old case, but because I had seen in the press, as I stated, representations to the effect that there had been favoritism in the Kelly matter I thought it was well to bring it up. However, I do not accept the reports in the press as against the statements made by the Minister of Justice. It is well that the public should know that my hon. friend found good and sufficient reason for the action he took, because although he states that Kelly had served twenty-one months, including the time he was awaiting trial and that spent in prison after sentence, one must not forget that the matter in which he was involved was a very serious one, and that if the public are led to believe that criminals who are found guilty of such offences as the one in question receive favourable treatment at the hands of public men for political considerations, they would lose confidence in the administration of justice. Personally, I must say that, having heard the explanation given by the minister and knowing the medical certificates which were sent to him, I do not hesitate to accept his statement in preference to the statements made in the press. The minister will not think I insist on getting the information for the pleasure of ventilating this matter before the public. It is well that the public should know that every man receives even-handed justice before his peers. While I am on this subject of ticket-of-leave, may I call the attention of the minister to another question—

Mr. MORPHY: Will the hon. gentleman permit me to interrupt? Will the Minister of Justice tell me how many Kellys got out

of the penitentiary last year, and give us a little of the history of the other two?

Mr. DOHERTY: I must confess I do not keep a special register for the Kellys. At the moment I did not recall there were other Kellys who got out during the course of last year. "Kelly" is a name which is not rare. Perhaps the hon. gentleman will give me some more definite information.

Mr. MORPHY: The reason I ask the question is because I saw that there was a man named Kelly convicted on a charge of manslaughter, and owing to some laxity in the penitentiary another Kelly, who should be released, was not released, but the man who was convicted of manslaughter was released, although he should have been kept there for a long term of years. The Kelly who should have been released was, of course, released afterwards. I wanted to know if there were any more Kellys, and what peculiar charm there is about the name of Kelly that gives them a ground floor advantage in the penitentiary.

Mr. DOHERTY: The other Kellys were Reillys.

Mr. LEMIEUX: The other question to which I wished to refer is the dynamiting outrage in Montreal. According to the press reports, three of the culprits are ticket-of-leave men. Of course, a ticket-of-leave is never a certificate of virtue, but at the same time it is remarkable that three of those ticket-of-leave men should have been found acting in conjunction with the other dynamiters. Perhaps the minister is too lax in his methods, or perhaps his heart is too tender. I would not charge him with laxity, but, perhaps, he might be open to the suggestion of tender-heartedness. It is remarkable that Elie Lalumiere, although he may not have been a jailbird, was just nearing the jail. The minister will remember that this man's name was very prominent in a famous case a few years ago, and that he was doing some very evil work in a certain election. However, I am referring only to the real jailbirds who were released under ticket-of-leave. Can the minister explain why there was a sudden exit from the penitentiary just at the proper time for these men to take part in this dynamiting outrage in Montreal?

Mr. DOHERTY: With all respect, I must confess the question put by my hon. friend is a somewhat extraordinary one. In dealing with tickets-of-leave we endeavour to ascertain the past, we do not pretend to prophesy for the future. My information is that only two of these men were ticket-of-leave men.

Mr. LEMIEUX: There may be only two ticket-of-leave men, but certainly another had "done time." Of course, I do not claim the minister is responsible for him.

Mr. DOHERTY: As regards the other two——

Mr. LEMIEUX: They are wards of the minister.

Mr. DOHERTY: —how they happened to get out in time to do this I do not think I can say, except that they did it after they got out. Certainly I do not suppose the hon. gentleman desires to suggest that the idea of letting them out on ticket-of-leave was that they should engage in the commission of the crime.

Mr. LEMIEUX: Are they not shadowed after their release?

Mr. DOHERTY: A ticket-of-leave man is under the obligation to report monthly. With regard to the suggestion of tender-heartedness, I shall be very happy to furnish my hon. friend with a report of our operations under the Ticket-of-Leave Act. I am glad to say there are a large number of men allowed out on ticket-of-leave, and more glad to say that a very small percentage of the men released on ticket-of-leave forfeit their privilege. Everybody knows that a ticket-of-leave man committing an offence within the duration of his ticket-of-leave forfeits the time he had to serve when he got the ticket of leave, and has to return to the penitentiary. The last time I had occasion to look at the figures, I saw that only from four per cent to five per cent of all those who obtained tickets-of-leave fell back into crime.

There are cases where they do. But in the case of these two criminals, after they had been released, they proved most unworthy of the clemency that had been extended to them. As to that we were not in a position to judge by anticipation. I have not now in mind the particular circumstances leading up to the sentence which they were undergoing when they were released, but I am informed that the sentences were not extremely severe. Moreover, at the time the recommendation was made, it was in contemplation that these men, who were soldiers, should be returned to their calling. Subsequently, the military authorities for some reason did not wish to take them back.

Mr. LEMIEUX: I see that the name of an officer, either of the Justice Department or of the Dominion Police, is mentioned in connection with this dynamite case. I read the evidence yesterday in the press, and this man seems to have been a frequent visitor with Lalumière at the meetings which were held and offered to procure arms for the other culprits. Perhaps it is too soon to speak of the case until the whole of the evidence has been given, but if it be true that an officer of the Dominion Police, or of the Justice Department, was connected with the affair in that way, it seems that it is not conducive to public order. If any officer incites a person to commit a crime he acts beyond his duty.

Mr. DOHERTY: I am satisfied that no officer acting under the directions of Sir Percy Sherwood, Commissioner of Dominion Police, would have acted, with instructions, in such a way as to incite any one to commit a crime. If any such thing has taken place, I can assure my hon. friend that in due time it will be carefully looked into.

Mr. LEMIEUX: I read the evidence of Tremblay, one of the witnesses yesterday—is it true that he is also accused?—and he stated most positively that at a meeting this officer, Desjardins, was present and told the culprit that he could get arms and weapons from the armoury. That is in the press of yesterday.

Mr. BUREAU: The Minister of Justice (Mr. Doherty) just now said that the hon. member for Rouville (Mr. Lemieux) would not suppose that anybody would try to get convicts out because he had any interest in getting them out, and that any such thing would be scandalous. It must be within the memory of the Minister of Justice that a celebrated convict and highway robber, who had held up the Canadian Pacific train at Mission Junction, got out of the British Columbia penitentiary. All the officers of the Justice Department at that time who had anything to do with the penitentiary not only were accused of having information about the contemplated escape, but were actually charged with having connived at getting the convict out of the penitentiary so as to share in certain Australian bonds which were supposed to have been stolen, although the bonds never existed. The name of the man was Bill Miner.

Mr. DOHERTY: I do not think I have any responsibility for that.

[Mr. Doherty.]

Mr. BUREAU: I do not say the minister had but he was in the House and the Justice Department was under criticism at the time.

Mr. DOHERTY: I think I have heard the name.

Mr. BUREAU: I see an item here:

To increase the salary of Joseph Adolphe Renaud, K.C., legal officer, to $4,000, from April 1, 1917, $600.

I do not object to that, it is a well deserved increase and I do not think that any of the legal officers are overpaid in the Department of Justice. If the minister will allow me, I am going to take up another subject. The Quebec judges, in what they call the rural districts, in my estimation, are underpaid. I will take the district where I practice—Three Rivers. The judges are getting $5,000, while in Quebec and Montreal they are getting $7,000. The $7,000 paid to the Quebec and Montreal judges is not too much, but the $5,000 paid to the judges of Three Rivers is too little. I asked the attention of the Minister of Justice to this question once before, and one of the reasons that was given at that time why the judges in Montreal and Quebec were paid higher salaries was that the cost of living in Montreal and Quebec was higher. I do not think that reason stands good to-day. I call the attention of the minister to the extra work that devolves upon these judges in rural district and the amount of extra cost which is imposed upon them on account of their residence. In Montreal they have a very large law library which is at the disposal of the judges when they want to study a case. In the district where I live we have not such a library, for the reason that the fees that are paid by students who are called to the bar are generally paid in Montreal and Quebec. These students attend the universities of McGill and Laval in Montreal and Laval in Quebec, they are generally articled with Quebec or Montreal lawyers and most of them remain with the firms with which they have been articled. In the Three Rivers district the judge has to subscribe for the law publications and he has to pay out of his own pocket for the text books he requires and which are not in our library and which we cannot afford to buy because we have not sufficient revenue. I maintain that more work is imposed upon the judges in the rural districts than is imposed upon the judges in Montreal and Quebec. In Montreal you have the circuit court while in our district we have no such court. They sit as

a court of appeal that hears all municipal appeals with regard to valuation rolls, etc. They sit as a court of appeal in all cases under the Fish and Game laws. In addition to that the Superior court judge acts as an arbitrator. In our district all expropriations under the provincial Railway Act, for transmission lines and for water-power development are heard before a judge of the Superior Court sitting as an arbitrator. In view of the fact that our judges are overcrowded with work, would it not be possible to put them on the same footing as the judges in Montreal and Quebec and raise their salaries from $5,000 to $7,000? I think it is only a matter of justice.

I am speaking for the district in which I live with the circumstances of which I am well acquainted. That district has developed far more rapidly than any other district in Quebec on account of the water powers located on the St. Maurice river and on account of the new industries which have been established there. At the time the two judges were appointed, Shawinigan Falls was a town of probably 2,000 inhabitants. According to the last census, there are over 11,000 people there. At that time lands along the St. Maurice river were considered valueless. To-day they are considered very valuable, and every day more disputes arise. Furthermore, expropriations in connection with all these water-power developments create litigation. Grand'Mere, which had about 2,000 or 3,000 people, is now a town of about 10,000 or 12,000 people. Three Rivers at that time had about 12,000 inhabitants, and to-day it has over 22,000. Along the St. Maurice, Cap Madeleine, which had formerly 1,200 people, now has 4,000 or 5,000 owing to new industries established there. All these industries in these town create litigation under the Workmen's Compensation Act. These judges are put to greater expense than others, as they have no library accessible and have to purchase books for themselves. They should be put on the same footing as the others and receive $7,000 per year. I think that Three Rivers ought to be no longer counted as a rural district for judicial purposes.

Mr. DEVLIN: The district of Ottawa is much more important from a legal point of view and in other senses than the district of Three Rivers. Litigation is of considerably more importance. Mr. Justice McDougall was unable to take any holiday this summer, as he was constantly engaged in investigations or otherwise. There is really more work for the two judges in the district of Ottawa than for any two judges of the district of Quebec—perhaps I should not say than any two judges of the district of Montreal. This also applies to the second judge of the district of Ottawa, as his case is somewhat exceptional, and he is not labouring under the same conditions as Mr. Justice McDougall. Whilst I instance Judge McDougall, I would like to make my words apply to all the judges of the Superior Court in Quebec who have to-day a great amount of work, as the Minister of Justice knows, and who have also the same degree of expense, in view of the increased cost of living, as the judges of the larger cities.

Mr. EDWARDS: It may savour of presumption in the opinion of some members for any one not trained in the legal profession to dare express an opinion in regard to the salaries of judges. Notwithstanding that, I am going to take the risk. In my opinion, speaking generally, the judges in this country get more than they are entitled to now. As to a judge not being able to take holidays this year, he will be in a position to sympathize with all of us here, as we have not been able to take any this year. The judges have always had the advantage of very eloquent and able advocates on both sides of this House when their salaries were being fixed. We have always had a number of very able men of the legal profession in Parliament, and I hope always will have them; they are valuable men for the country. But I have always felt that they never lose sight, as lawyers, of the possibility that some day they might occupy positions on the Bench. The judges receive what must seem to the great majority of our people to be munificent salaries, and after serving for a certain number of years, they may retire on a good fat pension. That is how it strikes the ordinary man. Men in other walks of life have to provide for their old age, but the judge can retire on a pension fixed with the idea of enabling him to maintain the dignity which he maintained when he was on the Bench. There are cases where men who have retired from the Bench after putting in their time have engaged in other work which was even more strenuous than that in which they were engaged when on the Bench. It is all right to say that we must provide for the men who occupy the Bench a salary which will make them independent and above suspicion. How far

9 p.m.

has that gone in the opinion of members of this House? Session after session, we have had instances of Royal Commissions, where one judge has been appointed, perhaps in Manitoba, to act on a commission, and in the eyes of one-half the members he is a white-winged angel—everything that is good and pure. Then another is appointed to inquire into his conduct and he becomes a very different kind of man. Time and again we have been told that we must provide salaries for the judges that will place them above suspicion, on a plane by themselves. But we have also heard these men who are supposed to be above suspicion and above partisanship severely criticised by members on one side or the other according to circumstances. I am not a member of the legal profession, but I believe I am voicing the opinion of a great proportion of the people of this country, I think the majority, when I say that the judges are being well enough paid. Talk about them having a lot of work! What right have they to draw a salary if they do not work? Is it the idea that these gentlemen shall be placed upon a pedestal and that the greatest effort of their lives shall be to draw their breath and their salaries?

They are no better than other people to work. They are getting better pay than most people who are trying to make a home for themselves and something to live upon in their old age. Judging by the convictions, and by the way some of these men fill their positions on the bench, I think many of them should never have been appointed. Fancy a judge sending a boy of fourteen or fifteen years of age to the penitentiary for five or six years, for stealing two or three dollars in money and an old revolver. In my opinion, that judge ought to be sent to the asylum; he is not fit to occupy a place on the bench. The men who occupy positions as judges are, in the majority of cases, fine men, men of exceptional ability. Notwithstanding that, I do not believe that in all cases, nor in the majority of cases, a judge accepts the position purely and solely out of love for his country. I cannot get away from the idea that the judge was thinking somewhat of himself when he accepted the appointment. He looked at the salary, and considered the fact that, after a certain number of years, he might retire and have his old age provided for. There is no objection to that. It is perfectly legitimate to look at it in that way. As a class, considering the work they have to do, I think the judges are better paid to-day than any class of citizens in the Dominion.

Mr. BUREAU: I am glad the hon. gentleman from Frontenac (Mr. Edwards) stated that he did not belong to the legal profession, because, if he had said that he did, I would be inclined to think he was talking about something he knew nothing about. It does not follow that, because a judge sends a boy to penitentiary, he is acting unjustly. He may have been right in sending the boy there. I do not know about that. When the hon. gentleman says that judges have nothing to do but draw their breath and their salaries, he had better inquire into the work that they have to do.

Mr. EDWARDS: I did not say that.

Mr. BUREAU: The hon. gentleman said the most of them had nothing to do but draw their breath and their salaries.

Mr. EDWARDS: No.

Mr. BUREAU: I have to accept the hon. gentleman's statement. Hansard will show which of us is right. But the breath and the salary were mentioned. I say that there are no harder worked men in any occupation in life than the judges who sit in the districts wherein I practise, and I am simply asking that they be treated the same as other judges. The legal profession is not like the noble profession of my hon. friend, where you go and feel a patient's pulse, and then go home and sleep over it. The judge goes home with a case. He has the fortune of a man, or possibly the life of a man on his mind, and he is working twenty-four hours a day, if he is awake during that twenty-four hours. My hon. friend should realize that. A judge has great responsibility. If a judge makes an error, or if he ruins a man, the litigant can go to the superior courts in appeal from the judgment. My hon. friend is looking at it in a different way. He buries his victim six feet under ground. That is the end of it—heart failure. The hon. gentleman had no right to attack the judges as he has done. Our judiciary is the pride of this country, and no man in this country can deny my statement. I am not invoking a pension for a retired judge for personal reasons; my hon. friend may rest at ease in that respect. If I ask that the salaries of the judges in Three Rivers be increased it is not for my benefit, because if they offered me a judgeship on a golden platter I would not accept it. I think if I had desired such a position I could have had it.

Some hon. MEMBERS: Hear, hear.

Mr. BUREAU: There is no "hear, hear" about it. I am speaking sincerely, and if I were hankering for a position as judge, I would have enough pride not to rise in this Chamber and expose myself to the criticism: "Oh, Bureau, you want to be a judge and that is the reason you want an increase for the judges." I ask this increase as a matter of justice, and no one knows better than the Minister of Justice that in the province of Quebec our judges are harder worked than the judges in any other province, because they have to sit as a Court of Appeal in numerous cases. The judges of the Superior Court have to sit as a Court of Appeal in all municipal appeals, valuation rolls, and in all school troubles. A judge has to act as an arbitrator in all expropriation cases, whether for railway purposes or for transmission lines, or taking the shores of the river and flooding them in the development of water-power, which, in our district, is a very considerable cause of litigation. The St. Maurice is nothing but a cascade, and every day these cases are coming before the court. With the development of industries, many personal injury cases arise and come before our judges. They are more numerous by tenfold than they were five years ago, and yet the judge gets the same salary, while everybody is getting an increase because they say it costs more to live, which is a fact. It does not please my hon. friend from Frontenac to see a judge sit on the bench and assume the responsibility of deciding on questions involving men's lives and fortunes, because the judges do not cry patriotism and loyalty; because they have their work at heart, and perform it—and not all lip-work, as is the case with some men I know—he says they do not deserve to be adequately paid for their labour. I take exception to that, and I say that the hon. member had no right to say the things he has said to-night regarding the men whom I consider the hardest-worked men in the district where I live.

Mr. ROCH LANCTOT (Laprairie-Napierville) (translation): Mr. Chairman, we have been pleased to hear professionals, doctors, lawyers, and I think it would not be out of place that a farmer should also express his opinion.

I congratulate my hon. friend from Three Rivers (Mr. Bureau) who has just told this House that, if he asks for an increase of salary for the judge of his district, it is not that he is aiming at a judgeship for himself. Most assuredly, Mr. Chairman, my hon. friend is an exception, to the rule in that regard, and I congratulate him, because very nearly every lawyer in the political maelstrom is seeking high office. The judicial Bench is considered very much in the light of a reward for political services; I have no objection to that. But, Mr. Chairman, what I object to is that a man appointed to the judicial Bench who is the recipient of a salary of $5,000, should pretend that he is underpaid.

I have had the honour of sitting in this House for some years past; as every other member, I draw an indemnity of $2,500 per annum; I never complained of it, no more than I do because this present session is not remunerative. But what I want to lay stress on, Mr. Chairman, is this, that at a time when the country is, to a certain extent, overwhelmed with the excessive burden of the war, this House should not be asked to authorize unnecessary increases of salaries. For my part, I believe the judges of the land are receiving fair and sufficient salaries, and that they may live very fairly even if, now a days, the cost of living may be said to be rather high. If a certain public officer, receiving a salary of $5,000 a year, asks for an increase, under the pretence that such an amount is inadequate, what then about the people, in general, who are earning a great deal less? For, it is not every one who has the chance of earning an annual salary of $5,000 or of $7,000.

There is another matter to be equally taken in to consideration, that is that judges may become disabled in a very short time. We have an instance of this in this very House.

Mr. WILSON (Laval) (translation): And young judges too.

Mr. LANCTOT (translation): And young judges too, as my hon friend from Laval aptly remarks. Those judges, having become disabled, claim pensions. I have taken the trouble, Mr. Chairman, of calculating the amount already paid and probably payable by this country to the hon. Minister of Justice (Mr. Doherty). This gentleman, because he has occupied a seat on the judicial Bench in Montreal for fifteen years, will probably cost the country $400,000.

The CHAIRMAN (Mr. Rainville) (translation): I would point out to the hon. member that the Committee is now invited to discuss an item concerning some increases in the salaries of the employees of the Justice Department. I would ask him

to limit his remarks, as much as possible, to the special item of the estimates now under discussion.

Mr. LANCTOT (translation): I do not exactly know, Mr. Chairman, which item the Committee is now discussing, but what I do know, is that the members who have preceded me did speak about the judges of the land, and I do not see why I should not also be permitted to speak upon that subject, on behalf of the electors whom I represent. I think I am entitled to make some comparisons, and if certain hon. members of this House ask that the salaries of the judges be increased, I believe it is my duty to institute comparisons, and that is why I quote the example of the hon. Minister of Justice (Mr. Doherty), a thing which I have, indeed, already done in this House.

I therefore say that the judges who are now receiving a remuneration of $5,000; it is not only that sum of $5,000 which is their salary, because they expect to draw, moreover, a pension, fifteen or twenty-five years later. A judge whose salary is $5,000, fifteen years if he becomes, fifteen years later, afflicted with some infirmity, disabling him from the due execution of his office, he gets his superannuation on a retiring allowance of the two-thirds of his salary—even if he is not disabled, as says the hon. member for Portneuf (Mr. Delisle)—but, if he occupies a seat twenty-five years on the judicial Bench, he is entitled to retire on full salary; so that, should he live twenty-five years more, his annual judicial salary will not have been $5,000 but, actually, $10,000. Now, I want to tell this House that the judges are the only privileged ones. In every country in the world, nobody receives a pension or an annuity, unless he has previously paid some money in order to get such a pension, the judges are the only ones who do not pay one cent and who draw a pension after fifteen or twenty-five years.

I am wondering wherefore this discrimination. Is it because there has always been in this House so many lawyers, on either side, to pass such measures almost unseen, in order to reciprocate later? In fact it is generally admitted that judges don't die quick enough, and if they don't wish to withdraw from the Bench, their wishes are even anticipated; some are forced to retire before Parliament is dissolved. I even predict that, before this Parliament ceases to exist in order to go before the country, some judges now on the Bench will be interviewed and spoken to as follows: "Please, do resign, we have members whom it will be impossible to re-elect in their counties, and we would like to put them on the Bench." That is the policy of governments, Conservative or Liberal, and that is why such a system must necessarily disappear.

I have already had the honour to introduce into this House a Bill to the effect that no pension be granted to a judge, unless he has occupied a seat on the judicial Bench for twenty-five years or he be an invalid; but not an invalid to become a member of this House, a senator or a minister.

I say that, in a future Parliament, such a state of affairs must be remedied; that a Bill must be introduced to wipe out these bad laws, and I hope we shall then have another Minister of Justice, who will listen to our complaints and will not hesitate to introduce such a Bill in order to put a stop to this money riot.

Is it not absurd, indeed, to see a Minister of Justice drawing $5,000 as a minister, $2,500 as a member and a pension of almost $5,000? Would that be tolerated in any country? I do not believe it; not even in China or Japan. It is only here, in Canada, that such things can be seen.

I declare it again, even to-night, that if God spares me, and should I sit here in the next Parliament, I will once more introduce a Bill in order to take away their pensions from those who do not deserve them; I believe that, instead of taxing the poor people for war purposes, these pensions should be suppressed, for the object of the Act was to superannuate only disabled judges or those having served for twenty-five years.

Why, Mr. Chairman, pay a pension to this gentleman? Would it not be better to pay that amount to a charitable fund, the Patriotic Fund, for instance, or else employ it towards our war expenses? I declare it to be an abuse of power, and I want to register as strongly as I can my protest against such a state of affairs.

Hon. Mr. BUREAU (translation): It is evident my hon. friend has not taken my observations in the same sense I had stated them. He pretends to speak on behalf of his electors who are almost all of them farmers. It is also in the name of the farmers I am protesting, since the judges of rural districts are not treated as fairly as those of the cities of Montreal and Quebec. I repeat it, my only object was to do justice to the agricultural class and that, by granting the judges of the rural districts a sufficient salary to afford them the means of having a library, a thing they absolutely

need for the judicious exercise of their functions. I do not think my demand either exaggerated or unfair since, in my opinion, at least, the judges of the rural districts deserve quite as much as the judges of large cities, such as Montreal or Quebec. If the objection made until now to my proposition, that of the high cost of living in the cities, was formerly a just one, it has certainly ceased to be to-day, for I have personally realized that it costs more to live in Three Rivers than in Montreal or Quebec. I therefore see no reason for my hon. friend from Laprairie-Napierville to be scandalized; my demand is based upon the principle that the position and remuneration of judges appointed to administer justice in country districts should be such as to render full and ample justice to the agricultural class.

Mr. LEMIEUX: I am pleased to see that Mr. J. A. Renaud, K.C., is being given equitable treatment. He has had a long career at the bar He was a lawyer of eminence in the district of Joliette, where he had a large practice. I know that in the Department of Justice he is doing splendidly.

Sir WILFRID LAURIER: Is this vote in regard to Mr. H. B. S. Lane a special vote, not in accordance with the Act?

Mr. DOHERTY: The case of Mr. Lane is inserted by name because this is not an increase in the ordinary sense of the Civil Service Act. Mr. Lane has been in the department for thirty-eight years. He is the chief accountant in the penitentiaries branch. He is at present receiving a salary of $2,600. The increase is to make it $2,800. The length of his service appears by what I have just said, and the efficiency of that service is borne testimony to in the highest terms by all of those who have been over him during this very long period of faithful service. Under those circumstances, it was thought justifiable to recommend that he should have this increase of $200 per annum.

Mr. C. A. WILSON: I am glad the Minister of Justice had given credit for length of service. I think I know Mr Lane, and I have no doubt what the minister said about the length and value of his services is quite correct. I would like to see the same increase granted to such an old employee as the present warden of the St. Vincent de Paul penitentiary. I do not know exactly how many years he has been in the service in that institution, but I would not be surprised if he had been there for thirty or thirty-five years. His salary is only $2,800. I understand he has some living accommodation. If Mr. Lane deserves an increase on account of length of service, this gentleman also deserves an increase.

I am delighted to see that some of the officers in the Department of Justice are getting an increase; I think they well deserve it. If the minister will permit me to refer to a conversation I had with him some time ago, I should like to remind him of the claims of the penitentiary guards for a higher salary. I see that the officers of the penitentiaries with salaries of $1,000 or less are to get a bonus of $100. That is a step in the right direction, but it is not much to the penitentiary guards at St. Vincent de Paul, for instance, who receive only $800 a year. An officer of that institution with a salary of $1,200 a year told me the other day that after exercising all possible economy, his living expenses for the month amounted to $8 or $10 more than his salary. As the law stands, I know these men cannot be granted a statutory increase, but the law should have been amended. As the minister is granting a bonus, however, I would strongly urge that it be increased from $100 to $200. I think every man employed in our penitentiaries should receive $1,000 at least. I have no political end to serve in making this suggestion; I make it simply because of the high cost of living, and the difficulty that the guards at the penitentiaries have in making both ends meet. They have to be on duty from six in the morning to six at night, and are forbidden, and their wives as well, to engage in any other occupation which would bring them in money. How can a man live on $800 when the necessaries of life are so dear? I had to pay $10 for a ton of coal for my country residence the other day. That may not be much to me, but it is a big item for a poor man, and other household expenses have increased accordingly. It costs the guards more to live at St. Vincent de Paul than in the city of Montreal, because, working from six in the morning till six at night, they cannot get in to market. I am delighted to see these two legal officers at Ottawa getting their increases, but it seems to me that it is always the higher-salaried officials who get an increase. It is the poorer paid men who should be looked after. Speaking of old employees, might I refer to the hospital overseer, who is well known to the Minister of Justice. This man, who has a very large family, is not receiving the salary a certified clerk in a drug store in Montreal would get, and he is getting no increase at all. I would urge

the minister to take this case into his consideration.

There is another matter. The minister may have found out from his inspectors that there is a great temptation on the part of the guards to engage in some trading amongst the convicts in liquor, tobacco, drugs and things of that sort, because, as I have said, they are forbidden to engage in any occupation outside of their own work, and the salaries they receive are so small. The other day some of the guards came up to me and made certain representations, and I advised them to quit the service. But they said that they had been in the service ten, twenty or thirty years, and must stick to it now, and regulate their mode of living according to their salaries. I remember when I came to this House in 1908 the guards were receiving only $500 a year, but I succeeded in getting that raised to $800. But I am not satisfied with that. I think $1,000 is not a bit too much for any of these employees, if you want to get good, reliable men. I am sure the Minister of Justice knows that he has had to dismiss several guards for trading with the convicts in order to make a little extra to support their families. Now there should be no necessity for that. The most dangerous element of our population is kept at these institutions, and the men to look after them should be above suspicion, and of first-class character. These men are doing work that is just as important to the welfare of the State as the work that is being done by the soldier at the front, and it is a dangerous occupation too. Not very long ago a deputy warden in the West had his throat cut by one of the convicts, and there is still fresh in the memory of many of us the mutiny at St. Vincent de Paul, in which Dr. Laviolette proved himself a hero. The lives of the guards are always in danger. I would again urge upon the minister to increase the bonus from $100 to $200, rather than increase the salaries of men who get $25 a day for making an investigation—I will not mention any names at the moment.

Administration of Justice, Exchequer Court of Canada—To provide for the publication of the Exchequer Court reports by contract, $2,000.

Mr. BUREAU: Has the increase been caused by the general increase in the cost of printing, paper, binding, and so on, or is it on account of the greater number of cases reported?

Mr. DOHERTY: It is the introduction of a new system in the making of those reports. It arises out of the following circumstances. The present Mr. Justice Audette, assistant judge of the Exchequer Court, was, previous to his appointment, registrar of the court, and at that time Mr. Morse was the reporter. When Mr. Justice Audette was appointed to his present position, Mr. Morse was appointed to the position of registrar, and it was then believed it would be possible for him to combine the official performance of the two duties of reporter and registrar. However, the work of the court has very considerably increased, and in recent months it has been found that it is not possible, consistently with the proper performance of Mr. Morse's duties as registrar, that he should attend to the reporting of the cases. Members of the profession will understand the importance of promptitude in the turning out of these reports. As a result of existing conditions, the reports are actually six months behind. In taking up the question of what would be the most economical method of providing for a proper system of reporting, it was found that we could make this arrangement with the publisher, under which, for $2,000 a year, he would undertake the full work of the reporting.

Mr. C. A. WILSON: Would that be done by contract or is it an increase generally?

Mr. DOHERTY: By contract. We make a contract with the publisher to see to the proper reporting. The undertaking on his part is that the numbers shall be out within thirty days after receipt of the manuscript. I may say this is being done now as an experiment. We are asking for the vote for this year to put it to the test whether this will prove a more satisfactory method of having it done, as we anticipate, rather than the method of appointing a salaried official as reporter.

Mr. BUREAU: Is this amount to be paid to the reporter?

Mr. DOHERTY: The publisher undertakes to see to the reporting.

Mr. BUREAU: Do I understand that the publisher will take down the decisions, publish the reports, and keep the subscriptions he charges us for the reports, and in addition to that receive $2,000 from the Department of Justice?

Mr. DOHERTY: In the past, the work was done at the Printing Bureau, and the cost was not very much less than $2,000. Now we get the reporting done as well as the work which was formerly done at the

Printing Bureau. These two things are combined. If we had proceeded on the old system, we would necessarily have to appoint a reporter, and that reporter would get a salary of at least $2,000, and we would remain with all the cost of bringing out the reports as in the past. The system we are now adopting commends itself to my judgment as being a better arrangement, but I am asking for this vote only for the purpose of putting it to the test.

Mr. LEMIEUX: I certainly will not oppose any expenditure in connection with the Exchequer Court. Never has a court rendered such distinguished service to the country as has the Exchequer Court during the last year. I have only to refer to the famous Quebec merger case in order to prove my contention to the hilt. That case was referred to the Exchequer Court in virtue of a statute passed last year, and the Chief Justice saved at least $2,000,000 to the people of Canada by one stroke of the pen. In one case he saved an item of $500,000, and an item of $794,869.58. Although the counsel appointed by the Government to look after its interests had decided to accept the two items, they were rejected by the judge. Since this judgment of Sir Walter Cassels has been made public, the Government has taken the wise course of stopping this expenditure concerning the Quebec and Montmorency, the Lotbiniere and Megantic, and the Quebec and Saguenay railways. The Exchequer Court of Canada is a blessing, not in disguise, but a real blessing to the Canadian taxpayer. It has just saved Canada from one of the most disgraceful and scandalous deals that ever came before this Parliament, and for my part I would vote with both hands for any justifiable expenditure to maintain and develop the Exchequer Court.

Mr. C. A. WILSON: In the supplementary estimates, penitentiaries, there is a vote made up of two items—to provide for a certain bonus to penitentiary officers, and to pay a compassionate allowance to Mrs. Mary Jane Mackenzie. If I am in order, I would like to ask the Minister of Justice when these items will be taken up.

Mr. DOHERTY: At the next opportunity we have of taking up my estimates. I understand it is the desire to proceed with other business now.

Mr. C. A. WILSON: Will it be next week?

Mr. DOHERTY: I hope so.

Progress reported.

WAR-TIME ELECTIONS ACT.

THIRD READING.

Right Hon. Sir ROBERT BORDEN (Prime Minister) moved the third reading of Bill No. 133, the War-Time Elections Act.

Mr. BUREAU: I was under the impression that we were to get a reprint of the Bill, and have an opportunity of looking over the amendments made yesterday.

Sir ROBERT BORDEN: It is on the Table.

Mr. MEIGHEN: It was distributed this forenoon.

Mr. BUREAU: I was told there were some corrections to be made, and that we should not use the copy given us this morning.

Mr. MEIGHEN: Without speaking to the Bill, I may say the reprint as it is, is correct. In the printing there was an item of four words left out on one page, and I think two or three words on another. The Bill is really very well printed.

Mr. BUREAU: We have not had an opportunity of looking at the Bill. Certain amendments were made yesterday, which were run through in a hurry, and we passed them on the understanding that this Bill would be reprinted and that we would have a chance of looking over the amendments to see how they worked in with the various sections to which they were added, and that they were all right. The Solicitor General should give us fifteen minutes to look into this Bill and see what it is.

Sir WILFRID LAURIER: I hope the Government will not insist upon us taking up this Bill to-night. We did not expect it.

Sir ROBERT BORDEN: I thought it was understood we should go on with the Bill for a little while this evening and adjourn the debate until to-morrow.

Sir WILFRID LAURIER: Adjourn it now. There is nobody here to take it up.

Sir ROBERT BORDEN: Could we not go on for half an hour?

Sir WILFRID LAURIER: No. I did not understand we were going to proceed with the Bill to-night. I think we should adjourn now.

Mr. MEIGHEN: The Bill was reprinted this forenoon. We rushed it for all we were worth and we got the French copy reprinted, too. There were several amendments, most of which were purely clerical. But it is important that hon. members

should have a chance of thoroughly reading the Bill, and, consequently, at the suggestion of hon. gentlemen opposite, it was agreed that we would not go on with the Bill at three o'clock, but that we should wait until to-night. I thought the leader of the Opposition (Sir Wilfrid Laurier) understood that we would take a little time on the Bill to-night and then go on with it to-morrow.

Sir ROBERT BORDEN: If hon. gentlemen did not so understand it we do not want to press it to-night.

Sir WILFRID LAURIER: Go on with it to-morrow.

Sir ROBERT BORDEN: In view of what my right hon. friend has said, I shall not ask the House to go on with the third reading to-night. But in the absence of any assurance that we shall conclude the third reading to-morrow, it becomes my duty now to give notice, under Rule 17B, which I accordingly do. I now give notice that I will move at the next sitting of the House that this debate shall not be further adjourned.

Sir WILFRID LAURIER: The Government has the right to give notice, and I have no observation to make on that point. But I would ask the Secretary of State to have the Bill carefully reprinted. I have had no time to look at it myself, but I am told that there are several errors in it, especially in the French version. I hope they will be corrected before it comes up to-morrow. I would also suggest that we should have the Bill early in the day, so that we can be ready for the discussion at three o'clock.

Mr. MEIGHEN: I had not heard that there were any errors in the French version, but I will have it thoroughly looked into.

On the motion of Mr. E. Lapointe, the debate was adjourned.

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

Friday, September 14, 1917.

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

WAR-TIME ELECTIONS ACT.

MOTION FOR APPLICATION OF RULE 17B ON THIRD READING OF BILL CARRIED.

On the Orders of the Day:

Sir ROBERT BORDEN moved:

That the debate upon the third reading of Bill No. 133, the War-Time Elections Act, shall not be further adjourned.

[Mr. Meighen.]

The motion of Sir Robert Borden was carried on the following division:

YEAS.

Messieurs:

Armstrong (Lambton),	McLean (Queens, P.E.I.),
Arthurs,	Marshall,
Bennett (Calgary),	Meighen,
Bennett (Simcoe),	Merner,
Borden (Sir Robert),	Morphy,
Bowman,	Morris,
Boys,	Munson,
Brabazon,	Northrup,
Bristol,	Rainville,
Burnham,	Reid,
Clark (Bruce),	Roche,
Cochrane,	Rogers,
Donaldson,	Schaffner,
Edwards,	Scott,
Elliot,	Sexsmith,
Foster (Sir George),	Shepherd,
Glass,	Steele,
Guthrie,	Stevens,
Hanna,	Stewart (Hamilton),
Hartt,	Sutherland,
Hazen,	Taylor,
Henderson,	Thompson (Yukon),
Hughes (Sir Sam),	Thornton,
Jameson,	Turriff,
Lalor,	Webster,
Lewis,	Weichel,
Maclean (York, O.),	Wright.—55.
McCurdy,	

NAYS.

Messieurs:

Boivin,	Lapointe (Kamouraska),
Bourassa,	Lapointe (Montreal, St. James),
Brouillard,	Laurier (Sir Wilfrid),
Bureau,	Maclean (Halifax),
Cardin,	Marcile (Bagot),
Delisle,	Michaud,
Demers,	Murphy,
Devlin,	Neely,
Ethier,	Oliver,
Fortier,	Papineau,
Gauthier (St. Hyacinthe),	Proulx,
Gauvreau,	Pugsley,
Kyte,	Seguin,
Lachance,	Sinclair,
Lafortune,	Truax,
Lanctot,	Verville.—32.

PAIRS.

(List of Pairs supplied by Chief Whips.)

Messieurs:

Ministerial.	Opposition.
Alguire,	McMillan,
Ames (Sir Herbert),	Nesbitt,
Ball,	Turgeon,
Barnard,	Achim,
Best,	Ross,
Boyce,	Martin,
Bradbury,	Cruise,
Burrell,	Douglas,
Carrick,	Power,
Chabot,	Beland,
Clements,	Knowles,
Cockshutt,	Charlton,
Cromwell,	Tobin,
Crothers,	McCoig,
Davidson,	Carroll,

Doherty,	Marcil (Bonaventure),
Green,	Buchanan,
Kemp (Sir Edward),	Robb,
McLeod,	Carvell,
Middlebro,	Pardee,
Morrison,	Molloy,
Nickle,	Kay,
Robidoux,	Copp,
Sevigny,	Lemieux,
Stanfield,	Macdonald,
Stewart (Lunenburg),	McKenzie,
Stewart (Hamilton),	Loggie,
Thoburn,	McCrea,
Tremain,	Chisholm,
Walker,	Bickerdike,
White (Sir Thomas),	Graham,
Wilson (Wentworth).	Wilson (Laval).

Mr. MARCIL: I was paired with the Minister of Justice (Mr. Doherty). Otherwise I would have voted against the motion.

Mr. CARVELL: I was paired with the hon. member for York, N.B. (Mr. McLeod). Otherwise I would have voted against the motion.

Mr. KNOWLES: I was paired with the hon. member for Comox-Atlin (Mr. Clements). Otherwise I would have voted against the motion.

Mr. TOBIN: I was paired with the hon. member for Compton (Mr. Cromwell). Otherwise I would have voted against the motion.

Mr. McKENZIE: I was paired with the hon. member for Lunenburg (Mr. Stewart). Otherwise I would have voted against the motion.

Sir THOMAS WHITE: I was paired with the hon. member for South Renfrew (Mr. Graham). Otherwise I would have voted for the motion.

Mr. BRADBURY: I was paired with the hon. member for Dauphin (Mr. Cruise). Otherwise I would have voted for the motion.

Mr. COCKSHUTT: I was paired with the hon. member for Norfolk (Mr. Charlton). Otherwise I would have voted for the motion.

Mr. DAVIDSON: I was paired with the hon. member for South Cape Breton (Mr. Carroll). Otherwise I would have voted for the motion.

Mr. WALKER: I was paired with the hon. member for St. Lawrence (Mr. Bickerdike). Otherwise I would have voted for the motion.

Mr. CROTHERS: I was paired with the hon. member for West Kent (Mr. McCoig). Otherwise I would have voted for the motion.

Mr. THOBURN: I was paired with the hon. member for Sherbrooke (Mr. McCrea). Otherwise I would have voted for the motion.

Mr. SPEAKER: May I be permitted to say that it is unnecessary for hon. members to mention that they are paired. The pairs all appear in Hansard, and it would save time if hon. members did not repeat them.

WAR-TIME ELECTIONS ACT.

MOTION FOR THIRD READING DISCUSSED UNDER RULE 17B.

Right Hon. Sir ROBERT BORDEN (Prime Minister) moved the third reading of Bill No. 133, the War-Time Elections Act.

Mr. ERNEST LAPOINTE (Kamouraska): Mr. Speaker, with the strict application of the rules restricting debate in this House, this Bill has reached its final stage. I have followed the discussion with the most careful attention, and while listening to the advocates of this legislation I could not help recalling the words of Disraeli: "a conservative government is an organized hypocrisy." The right hon. the Prime Minister and other gentlemen who sit on the other side sought to convey the idea that this enactment was for the benefit of those very men who are going to be its victims. They also stated that the winning of the war required this, as it required the giving away by the friends of the Government of millions of the public money to the Canadian Northern. They protested in loud terms that no party consideration had been contemplated and no political benefits had entered into account in the introduction of that Bill.

Sir, if the Government does not expect or hope for another verdict as a result of the change they are effecting in our electoral law, why do they make the change at all? On the other hand, if they expect such another verdict resulting from such a change, I state that it constitutes a dishonest manipulation of the franchise in order to thwart and frustrate the will of the people.

The Secretary of State (Mr. Meighen) who has been given credit for this undemocratic legislation, after having already been the recognized father of the closure rules and other narrow Tory enactments, was more frank in his cynical admission that he expected the Conservative party to get the votes of such as are given the franchise by this Bill, and the Liberal party to lose the votes of those whose

rights are taken away. Sir, I like to believe that the Secretary of State was not speaking seriously; he did not do justice to himself. I have much admiration for the talent of the Secretary of State, but I do not hesitate to say that a man whose ethics and convictions would permit him to consider as justifiable the tampering with the election law of the country on the eve of a general election in order to secure the return of his party, cannot be morally fit to occupy a prominent position amongst the rulers of this country.

This Bill is an expression of distrust on the part of the Government, distrust of themselves and distrust of the Canadian people. It is an admission that they lack the support and the confidence of the country; it is an indictment against themselves, and such an indictment only needs to be ratified by the people. The Government and its supporters are trying to get away from the judgment of those who have elected them and who are their natural and regular judges; they desire to escape a great popular consultation; they want to be judged by a sort of family jury.

This Parliament is being compelled by the Government to enact a measure which is opposed to the most elementary principles of democratic government. It does away with this fundamental rule without which liberty cannot exist, namely, the equality of all citizens under the law. One of the main articles of the great charter for which the people of France fought in older days read:

"Every citizen has an equal right to participate in the formation of the law and to the appointment of its representatives and agents."

A representative parliament must properly and justly reflect the nation; it must receive and return the nature, the proportions, and the peculiarities of such nation. Every citizen of the country has a sacred right to his proportional share in the national representation. Those are not German principles, they constitute the doctrine of liberty, and it is for the maintenance and conservation of such principles in the world that Canadian soldiers are to-day fighting in Europe.

This Bill shamefully destroys and takes away that equality and that proportional share which all Canadian citizens are entitled to in the administration of the affairs of Canada. The first main provision gives the suffrage to all female relatives of soldiers, whether such soldiers are dead or alive, are still in active service, or are discharged and again residents of this country. This is class legislation; it is the creation of a military autocracy; it is the very opposite of what is done by all the free countries of the world. Honourable gentlemen opposite are indulging in rhetorical expressions regarding the noble sacrifice of our soldiers. Most assuredly, we are proud of our soldiers; France also is proud of her soldiers; they are an army of heroes. Do you think, Sir, the French soldiers are given any controlling influence in civil affairs, in the parliamentary representation, in the elections of the representative body of the great republic? On the contrary, no soldier and no member of the national army has the right to vote in an election whether in peace or in war, except when on leave of absence for a period of at least 30 days. And I am not aware that at any time this condition of things has ever been detrimental to the great effectiveness of the army. But the French people have made too many sacrifices, they have spilled their blood too freely for the conquest of liberty to surrender the rights of government to a military class or autocracy. Here, in this country, we have given votes to all the soldiers, we have given votes to men who have never seen Canada, who do not know any thing about the affairs of this country, and we are now enacting a measure that will give votes to 400,000 women, on account of their relationship to those soldiers.

The Government is creating a situation which is fraught with grave and unexpected danger to the welfare of this country. The civil power must predominate over the military power, and not be subjugated to it. We already see in the newspapers telegrams and written statements emanating from generals, colonels, and other military officers criticizing the actions of this Parliament, and giving direction or advice to the Canadian people on questions which are debated or discussed in this Parliament and before the people of this country. This is a state of affairs which would not be tolerated by any self respecting people in the world, and I do not hesitate to say that the right honourable the Prime Minister should have taken steps to put an end to that most improper indiscretion. A few months ago, one of the foremost generals of France had to resign as Minister of War as a result of an equivocal word which was construed as putting in question the rights of control of the Parliament over all that relates to the army. The rights of the people, the privileges of this Parliament must be safeguarded.

But what can we expect from this Government when they set the example and show an utter disregard of the authority of this Parliament. On the 1st of January, 1916, the Prime Minister issued a statement or proclamation ordering that the army of Canada would thereafter be raised to 500,000 men, and that was done a few days before the opening of the session of Parliament and without seeming to realize that it was pertaining to this Parliament to make such a decision, and not to the Prime Minister, however, distinguished he may be. A well settled line of difference must exist between the legislative and the executive power, as there must also be a line between the civil and military power. Canada shall not stand for any kaiserism and that is the reason why this Bill is so repugnant to the people in all parts of this county.

I have another objection to this provision granting the vote to the female relatives of soldiers. I am not a partisan of women suffrage as many gentlemen in this House seem to be. In the province from which I come, this new move does not get the general approval of public opinion. We have been taught to consider the woman as a queen—the queen of the home—and we have always been afraid, rightly or wrongly, that by taking part in our bitter political contests, she should be exposed to lose some of that very delicate and superior respect that we all have for her.

But I am free to admit that in most of the other provinces of the Dominion, a strong current of public opinion is in favour of a woman suffrage, and that its being embodied in our electoral law cannot be successfully opposed. What is most objectionable is the granting of the suffrage to one particular class of women. If the granting of the vote to women is done to recognize their services and their sacrifices, and as an act of gratefulness on the part of the State and the Canadian people, by all means do not make any uncalled for distinction, but grant it to all Canadian women, for they are all qualified for such recognition.

I now come to the other provision of the Bill, which is perhaps the most objectionable. You are going to deprive Canadian citizens, British subjects, of rights and privileges which they now possess and which have been granted to them by a solemn contract to which the people of Canada, as represented by this Parliament, was a party. And, you are going to do this, not because of any misconduct or any act of hostility on their part, but as a penalty for having had the misfortune to be born in countries which they have left to get away from oppression and tyranny and in order to accept our invitation to come and help build up this country and breathe the free air of liberty. Is this British fair play, is this Canadian justice?

Let me read the section of our statutes which deals with the rights that have been granted to those citizens:

Section 24 of chapter 77, Revised Statutes of Canada, 1906, reads as follows:

> An alien to whom a certificate of naturalization is granted shall, within Canada, be entitled to all political and other rights, powers and privileges, and be subject to all obligations, to which a natural-born British subject is entitled or subject within Canada, with this qualification, that he shall not, when within the limits of the foreign state of which he was a subject previously to obtaining his certificate of naturalization, be deemed to be a British subject, unless he has ceased to be a subject of that state in pursuance of the laws thereof or in pursuance of a treaty or convention to that effect.

So that by receiving their naturalization papers they have been granted, unreservedly as far as this country is concerned, all the rights, political and others, which are being enjoyed by other Canadian citizens.

The hon. member for Calgary (Mr. Bennett) contended, and I was amazed to hear him bring forth such an argument—although one may expect almost anything from that great apostle of Toryism—the hon. gentleman contended that because our naturalization papers do not confer the status of British subjects outside of Canada, our naturalized citizens cannot claim in this country all the rights and privileges pertaining to British subject citizens of Canada. I would like to know what the Minister of Militia Overseas (Sir George Perley), who is only a naturalized Canadian, as those we are dealing with are, thinks of such a doctrine.

Mr. R. B. BENNETT: I suppose the hon. gentleman is aware that Sir George Perley has been naturalized under the statute of 1916, and has world-wide naturalization?

Mr. PUGSLEY: What difference does that make?

Mr. E. LAPOINTE: That makes no difference in the line of my argument. Is it to be supposed that because a third party refuses to recognize a convention entered into by two parties to a contract, any one of those two parties has the right to cancel the contract or to refuse to be bound by it? Surely this cannot be argued seriously.

Those whom you are going to disfranchise are free citizens of Canada and are entitled to all the rights of the other British subjects in this country. They are subject to the heavy taxation which it will be necessary to impose on account of the scandalous expenditures for which this Government is responsible, they shall have to pay their share of the millions which will be paid for the valueless stock of the Canadian Northern Railway Company, they and their children shall have to pay, for many years to come, their large share of the enormous sums of money and the many obligations this country will have to meet as a result of our participation in this war. Yet they will hereafter be refused representation in this Parliament; nobody will have the right to speak for them, and this House shall no longer be the true expression of the general will and of popular sovereignty.

I have only to say in conclusion, Mr. Speaker, because I did not like to hear the sound of your gavel, and I wish to finish my remarks before you use it: The Government is expecting much of this Bill as an electoral scheme. I must admit, however, that some of their friends are not altogether sure of what may be the result. To a crazy ship all winds are contrary. It is always dangerous for a government or for a political party to play with the franchise. The people like fair play, they like an honest game, they favour a loyal fight between parties as between men, and I have enough confidence in the people of Canada as a whole to trust that they will strongly and effectively resent this last desperate act of a despotic government.

Mr. W. E. KNOWLES (Moosejaw): Mr. Speaker, having once taken our place in this great world struggle and having, as a people, approved, as we have approved, of the action of the Government in placing Canada by the side of the Mother Country in this great conflict, the question must always be present with us in the conduct of our public affairs: what is in the best interest of the carrying on of this great struggle? And all questions that are presented to us for solution must be brought to the bar of that test and decided in the light of whether they are in consistency with the purpose of this war and conducive to our maximum military effort in this great struggle.

When I spoke upon conscription, I endeavoured to address myself to the subject along that line, and I desire to approach this question to-day from the same viewpoint, to ask ourselves whether the Bill which the Government asks this House to endorse is one that is in the interest of Canada from the viewpoint of doing our utmost in our way, small as it may be, to bring about victory and to relieve the suffering of the world in this great conflict. And in this connection I cannot but recall that in August, 1914, the two greatest Empires of the world classified themselves voluntarily, deliberately. The German Empire classified itself as a nation that was ready to pay a terrible price of money, blood and sacrifice on the side of broken faith and broken pledges. The British Government had no selfish or material object in view, but it was ready to classify itself on the side of keeping its pledge, even if it cost, as it has cost, hundreds of thousands of lives, for no material, political or partisan gain, but simply because they believed that the name of England would ring down through the nations in disgrace if she did not stand by her pledge and by her plighted word. We have asked our soldiers to go to the front and shed their blood for nothing material, but for principle, and we are still asking and will continue to ask them to do so. Many of them have fallen and it has been mine, as it has been yours, to walk in cemeteries in Flanders where thousands of our boys lie sleeping, and the only consolation is that they lie there because they loved principle more than material things, because they believed that the plighted word of England must be sustained, and that the honour of England must be kept high as it has been down through all the centuries before us. But now we in this country are asked to support a measure that takes the plighted word of Canada given in the name of His Majesty the King, and for no reason other than a miserable political reason tears into scraps of paper, not one treaty, but thousands, perhaps thirty thousand or forty thousand treaties and covenants, and in so doing we voluntarily classify ourselves in the same way as the Prussian Empire voluntarily classified itself in August, 1914. I have here the document which we hand to the man who gives to us the consideration for it, the oath of allegiance. That document reads:

> This is therefore to certify to all whom it may concern, that under and by virtue of the said Act "so and so" has become naturalized as a British subject, and is, within Canada, entitled to all political and other rights, powers and privileges.

Mr. MEIGHEN: Just read on.

Mr. KNOWLES: The balance has no cogency to my argument, but since the minister asks me to do so, I shall read it.

—and subject to all obligations to which a natural-born British subject is entitled or subject.

The weakness of my hon. friend the Secretary of State is shown in the fact that he asks to have read something that is entirely irrelevant to my argument, and he knows it. We have given to that man while in Canada, in the name of the King, all rights, powers and privileges of a political nature in Canada; and to-day, while he is still in Canada, the Government is taking those rights from him for no other reason than the same reason for which a robber will pillage things that do not belong to him, namely, for his own personal aggrandizement.

The record of these men in this country who took us at our word and made their treaty with us is one that can be studied with the closest criticism and scrutiny, and all the pages of the history of these men as a class in this war are free from any objectionable conduct on their part. From the very opening of this war they behaved themselves in an exemplary manner, and the Government has admitted this in the present debate. I go back to the short session held in August, 1914, and on page 14 of Hansard I find the following statement by the Prime Minister, dealing with the native-born Germans and Austrians.

We have no reason to believe that those people are inspired by the militaristic tendencies which influence the German Government at the present time or the Austrian Government for that matter. We have no reason to doubt, and we do not doubt, that these people will be absolutely true to the country of their adoption.

In the succeeding session, 1915, on page 20 of Hansard, the hon. Prime Minister, speaking of the Austrian and German-born:

So far as the others are concerned, I repeat what I said in August last when we were considering matters connected with the war that those of German birth and those born in the Empire of Austria-Hungary who have come to this country to be citizens of Canada have with very few exceptions borne themselves worthily and well. I believe that I can speak with peculiar knowledge as to this, because it has been part of my public duty to make myself acquainted with their sentiments and with the part which they are taking at this juncture of our affairs.

Deliberately, in the month of February of the succeeding year, the Prime Minister repeated the assertion which he made in August, 1914, and which I have just read to you. But it is not necessary to go that far back. We have the statement of the Prime Minister in this debate at page 5891 of Hansard:

I have not one word to say against the loyalty to Canada of these men.

And the Secretary of State said:

I am quite free to admit, that, taken all in all, those who come from alien enemy countries have, in the main, during the progress of this war, conducted themselves satisfactorily within lines of obedience to the laws of Canada. It is not based on any complaint of that kind that the principle embodied in this Bill is adopted.

Therefore I say that they are tearing up the srap of paper, for no reason of a national nature whatever. There is no suggestion seriously made that those who have come amongst us and made this country their home are anti-British in their feelings, and no suggestion that, at the polls, they will select men who do not wish to carry on the war. The thing is a falsity on the face of it. Those residents of western Canada are represented in this House, as has been said before, by hon. gentlemen who, irrespective of their party affiliations, have stood for the prosecution of this war to the utmost, and there is no suggestion that that is not the case. We have in Canada to-day unfortunately, many men who are far more against the win-the-war policy, as hon. gentlemen opposite, boastingly call it, or the carrying-on of the war policy, than are those naturalized citizens. We have men holding riotious meetings in certain parts of our country. We have certain men in the unions of Canada who have pledged themselves against conscription and they are quite within their rights in so doing. There are men who will come out in the open and say that they do not approve of the methods of the present Government in reference to conscription. There are stronger arguments against some of the men I have referred to than against these men in the West, who have kept silent. We have Mr. Bourassa and his press, and we have friends of the Government, who have preached to the people, and the first precept they would teach them was that, on no account, should they give any aid to Great Britain, and they were discouraging people from helping us in the present war. But there is no suggestion of disfranchising Mr. Bourassa, or Mr. Lavergne, or any of the friends, or quondam friends, of this present Government. The fact of the matter is that these German and Austrian citizens, so far as I know, came from Europe to disassociate themselves from the conditions which prevailed in their own coun-

tries, and they would be the very last to be filled with enthusiasm for those conditions, or the militaristic power in Germany. I am convinced that their wish is that the military powers in Germany may be crushed and overthrown. That is my belief, from my knowledge of the men, and there is no desire on their part that kaiserism, or the militaristic powers of the German Empire should be sustained. If, in this election which is coming, this great struggle, these people were allowed to vote they would have given their support to those pledged to win the war, because the candidates of both parties in the West will be in favour of a continuance of the prosecution of the war. If it could have gone forth to the world that the new citizens coming amongst us were filled with the desire to perpetuate, and to make victorious Canadian and British principles, it would have been one of the grandest encomiums that could have been pronounced, and one of the greatest compliments that could have been paid to Canadian and British statesmanship. It would have been a message, even to the Kaiser himself, that his militaristic days were numbered, that even those people from his own country were sending to Parliament men who were supporting the Allies in the prosecution of the war.

There is no way in which this Bill can be justified. If the Government were to lay down either of two broad principles I would say they might justify the Bill. The first principle would be this: that none should have the franchise unless they were actively engaged in the war. That principle, of course, is not laid down, and it would mean a straight military electorate. The other principle which they might lay down is that no one who is against the Government should have a vote. The Austrians and Germans in western Canada do not, generally speaking, live in cities, and they are largely Liberals for the same reason that English-speaking people in the country are Liberals, because they believe in the Liberal policy. We have not very many naturalized Austrians and Germans in our cities. They do not have to naturalize, and the people in the country must be naturalized, in order to get their homesteads, and over 95 per cent of the voting power of the native-born Austrian and Hungarian is a rural, or agricultural vote, and it is Liberal, not because of the war, but because it believes in the principles of Liberalism, and does not believe in the perpetuation of the high tariff power now in Canada. The hon. gentlemen are not manly enough to adopt the great broad principle that Liberals should be disfranchised and follow up that broad principle, but they come here in this insidious way, in this solicitor general way—I use the word in this sense as an adjective—and they beat round the bush, they draw red herrings across the trail, they split hairs, they appeal to race and passion and everybody in the country knows that this is a Bill for the perpetuation and the relief of the Conservative party, first, last and all the time, and it has no justification therefore, in the national way, and the Government itself is ashamed of the Bill.

I look upon this Bill as a great peril to us. If we are to lay down the principle that a government that is in power can go behind the Bill of Rights, and the principles of the Magna Charta, and can say, "We believe we must be perpetuated and continued in power, and we will disfranchise people who would vote against us," then the democracy is destroyed, and any tyrant who would assume power in this country could continue to possess that power, if you are going to once allow the principle that he is to be able to dictate as to who will vote. I view the matter with the greatest alarm, and I regret that the Bill is going through Parliament, and I say to hon. gentlemen opposite—to the Minister of Trade and Commerce (Sir George Foster), who, in my opinion, is not a bitter partisan—that it is unfortunate that through the passage of this measure the day will never come in Canada when the tyrant will look in vain for a precedent when he is desirous of putting his autocracy and his tyranny into effect. The day will never come when the wolf will not be able to look upon other instances in which the lamb has been devoured. The day will never come when autocrats will not have a precedent for asserting the German principle that "might is right." It is a sad day for Canada when we must admit that the Government, notwithstanding the fact that our boys are falling in the fight for the maintenance of our principles and our honour, have put before principle, before the honour of the country, political expediency and the serving of their own party purposes.

Mr. W. H. BENNETT: Did the hon. gentleman approve the adoption by the Saskatchewan legislature of a Bill to exclude from the right of voting naturalized Chinese persons in Saskatchewan, for which measure

the member for Humboldt (Mr. Neely) voted?

Mr. KNOWLES: That is a fair question; I can only give a fair answer. As far as I know anything about it, I did not approve of it. I do not like the principle of it, but I never studied it; it was not my duty to do so. However, that has nothing at all to do with this question. This Bill is following the German principle that might is right, not the British principle that right should prevail.

You, Mr. Speaker, were a member of a group of persons—I myself was among them—who had the privilege of meeting a number of men from South Africa, while we were for a month in Europe a year ago. You saw among them men who had fought in the Boer army against Great Britain; the Minister of Trade and Commerce also saw them. To-day those men are filled with undoubted loyalty to the Empire and to the British King. You were told, I doubt not, in conversation with them and with their English colleagues from South Africa, that they were won over beyond peradventure to the British Empire first and foremost because from Great Britain they had received a square deal; they had received freedom and liberty and justice, even while their hands were still warm from the butt of the rifle with which they had been fighting the troops of the British Empire. That is what made South Africa, when the great test came in 1914, loyal to the core as a British colony; it had learned from the British Empire the great principle, synonymous with British history, that men must have their rights; that the British subject, poor, humble, primitive as he may be, should not be denied his rights because the great, the powerful, the wealthy, the mighty, endeavour to disturb him in his enjoyment of those rights. I am not afraid of any substantial difference being effected as against the Liberal party by the operation of this Bill, but I can only say that my heart is sick for my country when I think that there are men in power who will force this iniquitous, vicious, un-British, Prussian Bill through the House simply because they want to gain partisan advantage in the coming election.

Hon. CHARLES MARCIL (Bonaventure): Mr. Speaker, I rise to oppose this Bill. I do so on the ground that it is contrary to the general policy of Canada, contrary to her past history, contrary to her future interests. I have had the honour of sitting many years in this House and of seeing men come in and go out. To say that the membership of the present Parliament is superior to that of the one which preceded it would be unfair—unfair to this Parliament as well as to the preceding one—and I shall not institute any comparison. But I doubt very much whether the men who laid down the basis of Confederation, with whose names every school boy is familiar, should have been led at any time to introduce a measure of this kind. Canada has been well styled the fairest and most brilliant of the daughter nations of the Empire. In the hostory of the Empire Canada has played a most brilliant part, because in the framing of the Act of Confederation and in other legislation we have laid down precedents which are known and recognized throughout the whole of the Empire. The name of Canada stands high to-day throughout the world because she is inhabited by two of the great races now carrying on this war in the interests of humanity and civilization. If we look back to the elementary procedure introduced here by the British Government by the Acts of 1791, 1841, and 1867, we see that at all times Canadian statesmen, backed up by British authority and by the British statesmen who came to this country, were actuated by a desire to have in Canada perfect equality, to make sure that Canada should remain what it always has been, a loyal colony of the Crown. Canada has on many occasions given evidence of her loyalty,

4 p.m.

but she has perhaps never done so in more striking manner than she has done since 1914. We all remember how this war burst upon us; how we were then enjoying a vacation in the summertime, thinking of anything but war. But when the call came; when it was announced that the Government of Canada had decided to send a division to the other side, Parliament was summoned—and let it be said to the credit of this House that not a dissenting voice was heard within its walls against all the measures submitted by the Government with a view to carrying on Canada's part in the war. That happy union which was effected in this House in the month of August, 1914, was continued until the present session of Parliament.

Canadians are loyal to the Crown and to British institutions. They have shown that on many occasions; they are still loyal. But, while they are loyal to British institutions, they have learned from the British Constitution itself and from precedents

which we have followed in this country that the rule of the people is sovereign; that in Canada the people must govern, as they do in other parts of the Empire. When the time came for the renewal of the mandate of this Parliament, there was a division of opinion in the country on the question whether the mandate should be renewed or whether there should be an appeal to the people. The Liberal party, with, perhaps one or two exceptions—the member for Nicolet (Mr. Lamarche) was not then associated with the Liberal party, although he voted at times against the Government—associated itself with the party in power with a view to extending the life of Parliament for another year without an appeal to the people. Unfortunately, during that year, instead of trying to cement the people together, instead of trying to bring them all to greater effort with a view to winning the war, the party in power adopted certain measures which caused a division among the people.

Finally the Military Service Bill was introduced and we had a rupture of public opinion in this country. The Act now before us is the following up of the conscription Bill. The Military Service Bill, of all others, should have been submitted to the people. I am sure that if this measure had been submitted to the people and had been carried by popular vote on a referendum or plebiscite, the whole of the province of Quebec would have submitted to the law as it is submitting to the law now. The people of that province have not been consulted, but they are submitting to the law because they are a law-respecting and a law-abiding people. Unfortunately, Canadians have divided on this Military Service Bill; not because they object to service which they are called upon to perform; not because they object to service which the Empire requires of them, but because the conditions and the notions of parliamentary government have been departed from. Canadians have looked upon the Government of this country as a government of the people, by the people, and for the people. Many a time in the old days I heard Sir John A. Macdonald and other leading men of the Conservative party proclaim, especially after 1878 when Sir John A. Macdonald scored his greatest victory, that the Canadian Government was essentially a government of the people, by the people, for the people and with the people. If any appeal had been made to the people a year ago or in 1915, the difficulties that we now face would have been avoided.

Either the Government or the Opposition of that day would have secured a mandate from the people, and having a mandate they could have carried out the people's will. Unfortunately, this was not done, and the Military Service Act is soon to be enforced. The attitude of the province of Quebec has attracted some attention, but I know the province will submit to the law until such time as it has been able to bring about its repeal, backed up by the public opinion of Canada generally.

This War-Time Elections Act, unfortunately, is not a war measure in the sense of the other "war measures" which I and other hon. members of this party have had the honour of supporting. It is more a political measure than anything else. It is introduced, as has already been said by those who have spoken from this side of the House, as a means of keeping the present Government in power. I make but few objections to the general regulations, because when I object to the principle, I do not care to discuss the details.

Regarding the enfranchisement of female relatives of soldiers, there is a large English-speaking element in my constituency, several hundred of whom have enlisted and gone to the other side. Since the war broke out the women of my county have had the honour of doing everything they could in the way of assisting, not only the Canadian boys, but the French and Belgian soldiers as well. They have formed patriotic associations, and have helped the Red Cross and have continually been sending comforts to the soldiers. These women are being disfranchised in large numbers by this Bill, because the majority of them, unfortunately, have no relatives at the front. I do not object to the granting of the franchise to the women relatives of soldiers who are at the front, because from what I have heard in my constituency I am satisfied that the majority of these women will vote like the men in that constituency will vote. On the political ground I have no objection to take, but I am sorry that an injustice is being done to the hundreds of women who have worked so devotedly and unselfishly for the soldiers since the war began, and who will be disfranchised by this Bill. I would draw the attention of the Secretary of State more particularly to the fact that this measure does a grave injustice to French and Belgian women in this country. In the city of Montreal, and the province of Quebec generally, thousands of young French and Belgian reservists enlisted and went to the front at the very outbreak of the war.

There have gone from the city of Montreal some six or seven thousand French and Belgian reservists, who are fighting as only French and Belgians can fight. At the Marne, Verdun and other places we have had ample evidence that the French soldier has not deteriorated. Under this Bill the women relatives of these men are disqualified, and I say that a greater injustice could not be done. These French and Belgian reservists came to this country as to a new promised land, where they thought they would enjoy all the advantages of a new country. Many of them married Canadian women, British subjects by birth and descent, and these women are being disfranchised by this Bill. We are told that that is because it is impossible to get at the Russian reservists who left this country to serve in the Russian army. But the fact that an injustice may be done to the women relatives of Russian reservists in this country does not justify an injustice to the women relatives of the French and Belgian reservists in this country. I am sure that if any consideration had been given to this point before the measure was introduced the franchise would have been extended to the women relatives of the Belgian and French reservists as well as to the relatives of the Canadian soldiers.

We have heard representations from the West on the question of debarring the Germans and Austrians from voting. I was sorry, in the early days of the session, to see some of our friends breaking away from us on the Military Service Bill, which was indeed an anti-Liberal Bill. But I am glad to see that on the question of maintaining the sanctity of British citizenship, these men have come back to Liberal ideals and to the Liberal fold. The greatest thing a British subject can boast of is his British citizenship. The British Empire has maintained an army and has waged war in all parts of the world for the purpose of defending British subjects, simply because they were British subjects. These German and Austrians have come to this country trusting in the promises which were sown broadcast in the literature that was distributed throughout Europe. They trusted in the promises made by our immigration agents, trusted in the speeches of Canadian statesmen who have often declared that Canada was to be a free land, the equal of the United States. Now that these people are in this country they find themselves treated as the French were treated in Alsace-Lorraine, and as the people of Poland are being treated by Germany. What a spectacle that is for a young country like Canada to give to the world. Canada has always boasted that she was, par excellence, the land where all classes could come. Under Liberal rule, thousands and thousands of people from all parts of the world invaded our Canadian West. Every day they came in by the thousands, and the total immigration for one year amounted to 350,000 or 400,000. Three years after the advent of the Liberal party to power, the new provinces were formed in the West, and a great many of us had the pleasure of voting for granting autonomy to those provinces. We told the people who came from all parts of the world and settled there that they were becoming citizens of a British country, and would receive the protection of the British flag, and that their rights and privileges would be respected for all time to come. But to-day we are departing from that promise. We are doing what Wilhelm of Germany did when he tore up the treaty by which he had bound himself to maintain Belgian independence. We are treating our promises to these people as a scrap of paper. I am sorry that the brilliant Secretary of State, a man who no doubt has a great future before him, should have supported a measure so unfair and unjust as the one before the House, which deprives these men of their votes, and deprives the French and Belgian women of the sacred rights which they have in common with their sisters of other nationalities. In after years, like many another distinguished man who has played a part in the history of this country, he may find that he has made a mistake. A right is a right, and a wrong is a wrong. Canada has done great things in the past. We have had several examples of British fair play in this country. We have performed wonders in the material, industrial and political spheres, and have astonished the world. I am sure the world has been impressed with what Canada has done since 1914. We have sent across to the other side an army of nearly 300,000 men, all of them ready to give their lives for the cause they thought sacred. It is true that the province of Quebec was not represented as largely as it should have been, but if the numbers were not there, the quality was. The French Canadian troops who fought at Courcellete, Vimy Ridge, Festubert, and Givenchy have proved themselves the equal of any soldier who fought on those battlefields.

These are the men who saved the honour of the province of Quebec, and if other methods had been adopted for the purpose of bringing about a larger recruiting percentage in that province, better results could easily have been achieved. Not long ago I read a letter addressed to the Prime Minister by Colonel Mignault of Montreal, who had been entrusted with the enlistment in the province of Quebec. When he returned from Europe he found that recruiting had fallen off, and he said that during his absence fully 100,000 men had become employed in the munition factories in the province, especially in and around Montreal, fulfilling contracts for war purposes. He gave this as his reason for the falling off of recruiting. They had been told that the man who worked in the munition factory, the man who worked on a government contract of any kind for war purposes, was doing as effective work as the man in the trenches, and the people of the province of Quebec had acquired that idea. Outside of Montreal the people of the province of Quebec are, for the most part a farming people. In my own constituency, for instance, they are practically all fishermen or farmers. How many of these men could leave Canada without bringing about a loss to the country? They are all producers of food, and they are all necessary in the country, and I know the exemption tribunals which will sit in that part of the province will exempt the great majority of them on that ground, because their presence will be more valuable here than it will be on the other side.

I do not want here to indulge in any further criticism of the Bill. I condemn the whole principle of it, because I think it affects what Canadians should uphold as the most sacred part of our Constitution—the sanctity of the ballot box. If we once admit that the fountain of power in this country were setting a precedent which might be unfortunate for the country in future years, if the present Government for alleged reasons of war takes upon itself to disfranchise a large class of citizens of Canada, and to enfranchise another class, what is there to prevent another party, or even the same party, which may be in power in future years, from doing the same thing at every general election, for other reasons? It is a most unfortunate state of affairs, and I believe for that reason it will be condemned throughout the country because it looks too much like a party measure which has not the support of the whole House that it should have had if it were a purely war measure. You have nodded to me, Mr. Speaker, that my time is up. I thank you for the patient hearing you have given me, and I conclude by saying that I know when the election day comes those women who are enfranchised in the province of Quebec and in the constituency which I represent will join us in bringing about the true condition of affairs which should prevail in this country, equal rights for all and privilege to none.

Hon. FRANK OLIVER (Edmonton): We are discussing the third reading of the War-Time Elections Act. We are dealing in that Act with one of the many problems of Canada, and it is because we are dealing with one of its most important problems in what appears to me to be a most unfortunate way that I have the strongest objection to this measure. Canada is a country of vast extent. It has great variety of population because of that vast extent, because of the variety of conditions and because of racial characteristics. The great problem of Canada is to establish a great country and to build out of these varying component parts a united citizenship that shall take the forefront in the progress of civilization. The great problem of Canada is to secure unity amongst our people. Perhaps it is unfortunate that we have not started out as a united country, but it certainly will be unfortunate if having started out in our national life as a country having a variety of national elements, we shall so carry on our public business as to accentuate those diversities of outlook and opinion that necessarily accompany diversities of race, of traditions, of surroundings, and of locality. Canada has suffered more during her past history on account of this division of race than from any other cause, and it is to be regretted that her statesmen in bygone times had as their ambition the maintenance of themselves in power rather than the building up of a united country. It was because of that fact that Canada stood still while her neighbour to the south went ahead. It was not until under the inspiration of the leadership of my right hon. friend the leader of the Opposition, when he was honoured with the direction of the affairs of Canada, that this country had an Administration which looked to success and progress through unity amongst our people. That inspiration and leadership brought the two great races inhabiting this Dominion together, working shoulder to shoulder in the common interest, and Canada made pro-

gress as she had never made before. She outstripped the best record of our neighbour to the south and it was more because of that unity of purpose with which our people had been inspired than any other point of policy. Unfortunately, that condition did not continue. Unfortunately it seemed good to those who are now charged with the administration of the affairs of this country to revert to the policies and principles of their traditional predecessors, and when the occasion arose, they followed the old policy "divide and conquer." and did what lay in them to split Canada in twain. When they came into power they succeeded in their purpose, and they split Canada, and Canada is now back where she was twenty years ago. It was hoped by many of the citizens of this country who looked for its progress and welfare that out of the stress and urgency of the great war a united Canada would emerge. It was hoped that in the support of a common cause, in the common interest of sacrifice for a great end, there would be found a means of uniting all our people, whatever their race, whatever their language, whatever their religion, whatever their locality, from the Atlantic to the Pacific, in the great name of liberty.

It is a most terrible thing that has occurred to Canada. It is more terrible than those sacrifices of life and limb that have been made in the interest of liberty. It is more terrible than all, that this great occasion, which should have been used to bring together the people of our country and make them one, from the beginning until the bringing down of this measure, has been used by the same men, who attained power on the principle of division and conquest, to exert every endeavour that lay within them to accentuate differences between the different peoples of this country. Time does not permit that I should dwell upon the attitude they have taken or the course they have pursued as to military matters towards the population of the great province of Quebec, but it is on record and it is within knowledge that they and their friends in that province, working for a common purpose but at opposite ends, have achieved the result they set out to achieve—the result of setting that province by itself as against the rest of the Dominion. Now they have transferred their energies and their attention to the prairie West, where the greater Canada must, if anywhere, be built. It is only in that country between the Red river and the Rocky mountains, where there is room and opportunity for a vast population, that we can have a great Canada. We have on these prairies men of different races, different ideals, different outlook, and it is a great problem that necessarily faces every one charged with the administration of the affairs of this country to assimilate all those peoples in the ideals of Canadian citizenship and British liberty. Some of these people are of German descent, some are of Russian descent, some of one nationality and some of another. As my hon. friend from Moosejaw (Mr. Knowles) has said, a large majority of them are a rural population, they are on the land because of the land, their ideals are attached to the land and above everything else their purpose, object, hope and aspiration is to build up in that great prairie West a country for themselves and their children that shall not repeat the conditions that they have left in Europe. It has seemed good to our Government to introduce this War-Time Election Act to disfranchise 40,000 people, naturalized citizens of Canada, men to whom the faith of Canada and of the King of England is pledged to give them the rights of citizenship. They have done nothing, they have contemplated nothing, that would warrant their being deprived of those rights. But our Government has seen fit by introducing this legislation to so deprive them of their rights. I ask you, Mr. Speaker, is that the way to build up a united Canada, is that the way to establish on those prairies a united and progressive population that shall uphold the ideal of Canadian citizenship and of British liberty as the highest ideal in the world?

We who live in that country amongst those people, who meet them from day to day, have held our heads high when speaking to them. We have claimed that we represented a different ideal from that with which they were familiar. We have told them that British liberty and justice was the guarantee that they had from the Government of Canada, a guarantee that would never be broken. To-day that guarantee is being broken by a Parliamentary majority, by a Government that has set itself deliberately to set the Prairie West by the ears as it has already a large part of old Canada. We have had good service from those we call foreigners in the West. They have been industrious, law-abiding and they have been producing from the earth as well as any one else. They have had before them the ideal of Canadian citizenship and British liberty. Can we expect from these men in the future the same result as in the past?

Will not they rather be turned to some other country, to some other condition under which they can achieve that which they thought they had achieved when they landed on our shores? I do not see how it can be otherwise than that we have turned back in the minds of these people that course of sentiment that was bringing them on and on and building into them the ideal of Canadian citizenship. We are doing what we can to prevent them from ever adopting our ideals and becoming citizens with us in this country.

The inspiration of the Government is being well taken up by those who are supporting them throughout the country. I read in this morning's paper a despatch from Regina which is as follows:

> Regina, Sask., Sept. 13.—A deputation of army and navy veterans has been appointed to go to Prussia, Saskatchewan, and demand that the Teutonic names of streets, such as Kaiser Wilhelm and Hanover, be changed to those of more British origin.

It can only be expected that the lead given by the Government will be followed by their supporters and that a course will be taken in these prairie provinces, such as has been taken in the provinces of Ontario and Quebec. In the Prairie West we have had no collisions of any kind whatever, and our people have lived in harmony and amity, we now see introduced there, as a result of this legislation, and as a result of the policy of the Government, the same conditions that have prevailed in Ontario and Quebec.

I say that this Government is committing a crime against Canada in the legislation that is now before the House, a crime the effect of which may be more far-reaching than any man can now see. And this legislation is being introduced by a Government which has been proclaiming far and wide for the past four or five months that it desired to govern Canada on non-partisan lines, that it desired a union government. And it is giving evidence of its good faith in desiring that Canada should have a union government in which there should be no parties and no divisions, where everybody should be united, shoulder to shoulder in war effort, by introducing a measure such as was never before introduced in the Parliament of Canada as a partisan measure; it is introducing a measure that goes far beyond the question of political partisanship to the question of disfranchising, decitizenizing, tens of thousands of the people of the country.

And this is the Government that wanted honest Liberals to take share with it in administering the affairs of Canada! We have heard across the floor of the House of the mutual bargainings between so-called Liberals on this side and members of the Government on that, the bargainings as to the exchange of principle for place, in the name of patriotism, in the name of honour, in the name of loyalty. Well, it is a long time since the man who was traitor to his principles had honour with the people. I think the same attitude of the public mind that prevailed 1,900 years ago and that has been handed down through all those centuries to the present time, will still regard the crime of Judas as the climax of villany.

Mr. G. W. KYTE (Richmond): Mr. Speaker, in the speech with which the Secretary of State (Mr. Meighen) presented this Bill to the House, he endeavoured to argue for its justification out of the precedent of similar legislation in Australia. I quote from his speech (Hansard, page 5725):

> There has not occurred as yet in any great country engaged in this struggle of unprecedented dimensions a general election. Where democracy governs nations in this war, it has not as yet left to individualism, by means of the ballot, the determination of the conduct of the war, save in one country alone. That country is Australia. When they were, in Australia, facing a situation such as we face to-day, but by no means as aggravated as ours, they prepared by legislation for the contest along lines similar to those of this Bill. They, however, disqualified for the war-time election all of their citizens who were of alien enemy birth, no matter how long they had been in Australia or how long they had been naturalized. This Bill does not go that far.

I endeavoured to get a copy of the Australian Act which was cited by the Secretary of State but have been unable to do so.

Mr. MEIGHEN: I think the only copy in Canada is in the possession of Mr. O'Connor, where the hon. gentleman may see it.

Mr. KYTE: I sought that Act indirectly from Mr. O'Connor. A gentleman who has something to do with the custody of documents in this House told me that he applied to Mr. O'Connor and that Mr. O'Connor told him he had not it. I applied at the office of the Secretary of State to-day. His secretary was good enough to say to me that if he could get his hands upon it he would let me have it, but I have not yet received the copy and I am therefore unable to argue from the text of the Australian legislation whether or not this House of Commons is justified in

going so far as is proposed in disfranchising a large element of our population. But I am able to argue from other circumstances and conditions existing in Australia that this Parliament and this Government are not justified in passing legislation of the character which we are now considering, even although Australia has thought proper to do so. To begin with, in Australia there is a coalition government, both parties are united for the purpose of carrying on the war. When conscription was first proposed in Australia, such a loud protest was heard among the people of that Commonwealth that the Government receded from its position, and instead of passing a military service law such as we passed in this Parliament, they consulted the people by a means of a referendum, and compulsory military service was defeated. Thereafter a coalition government was formed upon the basis of no conscription, and that Government is in control of affairs in the Commonwealth to-day. Again, the Commonwealth of Australia is populated by 98 per cent British-born; only 2 per cent of the total population of Australia are foreign-born. The Commonwealth of Australia never invited Germans and Austrians to become citizens. We in Canada are in a different position; we held out inducements to citizens of the Central Empire to come to this country, take up homesteads, become a part and parcel of our population and enjoy the full measure of citizenship. As I said, Australia did not ask for immigrants from the central countries of Europe, and only 2 per cent of her population are foreign-born. But there was a small element of the population of Australia that came from Germany. They came to represent the Krupp interest that established itself in Australia for the purpose of getting control of the total metal output of that Commonwealth. It is well known that at the outbreak of the war the Government of Australia found that the total mineral product of Australia was controlled through German residents in Australia representing the Krupp interests in Germany.

The first thing the Government of Australia did after the outbreak of war was to dissolve the corporation which controlled the metal products of Australia, and to take possession of it, in the interest of the Commonwealth and of the Allies. It is not, therefore, strange that a very strong feeling of antipathy should have developed in Australia against the limited numbers of Germans who were citizens of that Commonwealth. They were there, not as citizens of the Commonwealth, but as representatives of the Krupp interests in Germany, and spies of the German Government. It is not astonishing that, under those circumstances, a coalition government in Australia, or a non-party government would have been able to disfranchise those men who were notoriously alien enemies, without protest from any section of the community. But, as I stated a moment ago, that element of the population was exceeding small.

I referred to the drastic action taken by the Government of the Commonwealth of Australia to prevent German interests from continuing to control the metal product of Australia. How differently has that matter been treated by this Government. We know that, ever since the outbreak of the war, it has been alleged on the floor of this House of Commons, as it was alleged in the legislature of Ontario and in the press, that German interests in control of a certain mining corporation, having power to operate and control property in the province of Ontario, were shipping their nickel product to the United States, and across to Germany. It is also well known that, up to the very hour that the United States Government declared war against Germany, the underseas freighter Deutschland was carrying cargoes of nickel from New London, Conn., across to Germany. It is very well known that in 1916 no less than 764 tons of nickel was shipped from Canada by the United States to Germany. While the German interests sought the use of our nickel to manufacture munitions to destroy the Canadian soldiers on the battle line, this Government took no action. Why? Because it is well known that gentlemen intimately associated with this Government were large shareholders in the company that was interested in shipping the nickel from Canada to the United States, and thence to Germany. It is well known that the present Minister of Railways and Canals (Mr. Cochrane), while a member of the Ontario Government, entered into an agreement on behalf of the Government with this foreign nickle trust, to fix the rate of taxation which would be levied upon that corporation at a contemptibly small amount, notwithstanding the fact that the profits of that corporation amounted to from twelve to fifteen million dollars a year. Not only that, but the agreement was to extend over the years 1912 to 1916, and in 1916 the present Premier of the province of Ontario renewed that agreement

with the Hon. Wallace Nesbitt, K.C., on behalf of and representing that nickle corporation. But, Sir, if more proof is wanted that there is a connection between this Government and the German interests that sought the nickel in Canada to manufacture into munitions to destroy the Canadian soldiers, all I need cite to the House is the fact that, when an investigation was demanded by the members of this Parliament, both Liberals and Conservatives, as to whether or not Canadian nickle was being shipped through the United States to Germany, the gentlemen appointed for the purpose of conducting the investigation in New York was Mr. Graham A. Bell, the comptroller of the Department of Railways and Canals. We have every confidence in the ability of Mr. Bell as a comptroller of the Department of Railways and Canals. But when it came to holding an inquiry into the operations of the German nickle trust and its associate companies in the United States and Canada, one would imagine, if this Government were sincere in their desire to get at the bottom of things, they would have selected another gentleman instead of Mr. Bell to carry on the investigation.

Mr. STEVENS: I rise to a point of order. The matter which the hon. gentleman is discussing is not relevant to the question before the House.

The ACTING SPEAKER (Mr. Rainville): I thought the hon. gentleman was getting away from the subject before the House, and I was going to ask him if he proposed to use the statements he is making as an argument against the third reading of the Bill.

Mr. KYTE: I have sometimes the habit of getting away from the matter under discussion, and I also have a habit of coming back to it. I propose coming back to it now. I made this statement to the House for the purpose of showing that, if this Government is anxious to follow the precedent set by Australia in matters of legislation, it is unfortunate they did not follow the precedent set by Australia in dealing with the German interests in that country. I pointed out that the War-Times Election Act in Australia was passed by a non-party Government. I am not sure as to the date on which that Act was passed, but if it was not passed by a coalition government, it has to be enforced and applied by a coalition government. Non-partyism is the very essence of success in war measures. The Government of Australia may be justified in passing the War-Time Elections Act which has been referred to, because ever since the war broke the Government of the Commonwealth of Australia has been concerned exclusively with the passing of war measures. That is not the case with respect to this Government. While we have been uniting our energies for the purpose of carrying on the war, and devising legislation best calculated to direct all our resources and energies to the carrying on of the war, the Government has not been content to limit its legislative activities to war measures. This Government has placed party legislation before war legislation for the last three years. If this Government had confined their legislation exclusively to war measures, they might be justified under the circumstances in passing such a disfranchising Act as we have under consideration at the present time. Instead of confining the legislation to war measures, this Government in the session of 1915, passed an Act for the purpose of increasing the tariff and reducing the British preference. That was an issue upon which the parties in this House might well divide, as parties in this country are divided upon this question. They passed the income tax during the present session of Parliament, which is a substitution for the excess war profits tax, which has been in operation for the last two years. Party opinion is divided upon the wisdom of terminating the war profits taxation at the end of the present year, and substituting therefor an income tax, which will relieve the friends of the Government who have made huge profits during the war of a large proportion of the taxation which ought to go to swell the revenues of the country. The electors of this country who are disfranchised under this legislation will be debarred from passing judgment upon these party measures which the Government passed during the last three years, under the guise of war measures. Again, the electors who will be disfranchised by this Bill will be prevented upon expressing their opinion on other legislation which has been passed by the Government. There is the legislation with reference to the Canadian Northern railway, which involves an addition to our burden of some $600,000,000, and a payment of at least $30,000,000 at a time when the resources of our country and the ingenuity of the Minister of Finance are taxed to the utmost to procure money for necessary war purposes.

Then there is the legislation which transferred the Quebec and Saguenay railway to

the Government. We had under discussion a few evenings ago an item of nearly $4,000,000 passed by this Parliament in defiance of the judgment of Sir Walter Cassels, judge of the Exchequer Court of Canada. These matters the electors who are now disfranchised by the Bill before us will be unable to vote on.

There is another question in which the people are vitally interested and upon which they should be permitted to express their opinion. I refer to the failure of the Government to deal with the high cost of living and the fixing of the price of food products—matters which have been dealt with successfully by the governments of every other belligerent country. The Government hope to get by with everything done by them against the public interest, every failure on their part to properly perform their duties, by this legislation under which they purpose disfranchising 50,000 people in this country. All these things are done under the guise of war measures—all because we are at war. When the ex-Minister of Public Works resigned his portfolio on August 20, the folowing statement appeared in the newspapers:

> While Mr. Rogers was favourable to the original scheme of coalition government and to conscription, he is known to very strongly oppose the idea of union government on the lines now proposed. There was also a marked divergence of opinion on the question of disfranchising citizens of enemy nationality. The former minister insisted that it should be done. Sir Robert Borden would not agree to such a proposition, which he characterized as "ruthless."

This legislation shows that the member for Winnipeg (Mr. Rogers) is more powerful outside the Cabinet than he was inside. He failed to convince the Prime Minister that this ruthless legislation should be carried by the Government through Parliament, but he has since succeeded in getting the Prime Minister to introduce it into the House. It is generally suspected that the resignation of the ex-Minister of Public Works does not place him very far from the realm of influence with the Government; it is the general view that he is as competent to-day and as influential with the Government as ever he was. The ex-Minister of Public Works resigned because the Prime Minister would not give his consent to the disfranchising Act. We have now before us the ruthless legislation which the Prime Minister had refused to accede to, but which has been acceded to since the ex-Minister of Public Works left the Government.

Mr. D. B. NEELY (Humboldt): Mr. Speaker, it is not my intention to repeat in substance the arguments that I advanced against this Bill the other day on its second reading—arguments having mainly to do with the injustice accorded by the Government to a large number of the citizens of Canada, particularly of western Canada, who are to be disfranchised by this Bill. This afternoon I want to view the question from another standpoint: that of the breach of faith on the part of this Government with the members on this side of the House, especially those from western Canada, who supported the Military Service Act, which is now the law of the country.

I am sorry that the Prime Minister is not in his seat, because I wish directly to charge him with breach of faith. The Military Service Bill was carried with the aid of twenty-seven Liberals who voted with the Government. In voting as they did, the western Liberals voted as representatives of the people whom this Bill now proposes to disfranchise, namely, naturalized British subjects in Canada of alien enemy birth or extraction. If the Government thought that we were casting an honest and sincere vote on that occasion, then they are open to the charge of having broken faith with those who supported them on the Military Service Bill. We by our votes stood sponsors for the people whom the Government now proposes to disfranchise. The Government are declaring to the country that they have no faith in

5 p.m.

the word or the vote of the men who stood sponsor for this large class of citizens in western Canada. That being the case, I should like to have asked the Prime Minister, had he been in his seat, what was the reason of this change of front. So far as I know, not a member on this side of the House from western Canada who voted for the Military Service Bill has been consulted as to the effect the legislation now under consideration would have either upon their own constituents or upon the people as a whole. I should like to hear from the Prime Minister the reason why in this measure he casts an insinuation and a slur upon the honesty and sincerity of members on this side of the House who voted for the Military Service Bill and who at the same time stood sponsors for the class of citizens whom this present Bill proposes to disfranchise? Was it because of certain resolutions that were adopted at the Winnipeg Liberal convention on the 7th and 8th of August last that the Government have made this change of front? Some very im-

portant resolutions were adopted at that convention. One was a resolution condemning the Borden Administration because during three years of war it had carried on Canada's part in the war as a purely partisan proposition. That resolution I shall now read to the House, so that hon. gentlemen may judge for themselves whether or not the Liberals of western Canada were justified in adopting it. The resolution is:

This convention of the Liberals of the four western provinces of the Dominion assembled for the purpose of assisting in the solution of the many serious problems facing Canada at the present crisis feels compelled to place on record its most severe disapproval of the war administration of the Borden Government.

War is essentially the business and concern of the entire nation and not of any section, class or political party. It can be waged to the greatest advantage only when behind its prosecution all classes of its people are enlisted in the same passionate determination to defend the right, and triumph over the forces of despotism and unrighteousness.

Any attempt to arrogate to one section of the people or one political party a monopoly of its prosecution and the prestige of the conduct of a national struggle for freedom and existence can be characterized only as base and unworthy in the highest degree.

Because the Borden Government has sought from the outset to make our national life and death struggle a prerogative of one political party, to the exclusion of one-half of the Canadian people, and an instrument for selfish political advantage rather than the triumph of national ideals, because it has exhibited gross incompetence and inefficiency in the face of national peril; because it has substituted partisan selfishness for honour and fair dealing; because dissension has overcome leadership in its councils, and weakness and vacillation have taken the place of firmness, resolution, courage and efficiency in execution, we condemn it as no longer entitled to the confidence of the Canadian people.

Is there a line or a word in that resolution that is not absolutely justified by the history of Canada's participation in this great struggle for the last three years? The Prime Minister has himself condemned his own administration quite as much as the western Liberals do in the resolution which I have just read. Why has he been in conference week after week and month after month with Liberal leaders from the West and other parts of Canada for the purpose of forming a national government, if partisan government was not contrary to the interests of Canada in her war efforts? I say that the conduct of the Prime Minister for months past, since he made his first proposal of coalition to the right hon. leader of the Opposition, verifies in every line and every sentence the resolution against the Borden Administration passed by the Liberal Winnipeg convention.

[Mr. Neely.]

Does the Prime Minister, or any man on that side of the House, say for one moment that Canada's efforts in the war up to the present time have not been conducted on a party basis? If they were to deny that fact, the country would simply laugh at them. Even in connection with the proposal of coalition that was made to the right hon. leader of the Opposition, there had to be announced a policy which, in days to come, future Conservative leaders in this country could say was a Conservative policy, and that that policy had saved Canada's efforts in the war. I repeat that that resolution passed by the Winnipeg Liberal convention is verified to the fullest extent by what the Prime Minister has said and done with regard to forming a so-called national government after three years of party government during this great struggle.

There was another resolution passed at that convention which seems to have exercised the Tory press and the Tory political leaders throughout Canada to a very great extent. It was a resolution which I am proud to say I had the honour of proposing to the convention, and which received its unanimous support. It was the win-the-war resolution.

Some hon. MEMBERS: Oh, oh.

Mr. NEELY: I know this is bad medicine for some hon. gentlemen opposite, but they may as well take it; they are going to get it anyway. There has been a great deal of criticism on the part of Conservative newspapers and Conservative leaders throughout the country because a certain amendment proposed by the hon. member for Assiniboia (Mr. Turriff) to the win-the-war resolution was not agreed to by the convention. It was an amendment proposed to the second clause of the resolution. I do not wish to put on Hansard the whole clause, but will just read clause 2:

By the maintenance, in unimpaired strength at the front, of our fighting forces, and the taking of all steps necessary to secure the required reinforcements for this purpose.

My hon. friend from Assiniboia moved on the floor of the convention to amend that by adding the words "by compulsion, if necessary."

Some hon. MEMBERS: Hear, hear.

Mr. NEELY: Before you rap the gavel, Sir, I hope you will take this unseemly interruption into consideration.

Mr. SPEAKER: I will give the hon. member full credit for any interruptions, but I might point out that I think he is going

rather far afield. The question before the House is the third reading of the War-time Elections Act.

Mr. NEELY: My point is this—in this War-time Elections Act the Government have broken faith with the men on this side of the House who supported the Military Service Bill, and I am asking the reason why. I am asking whether or not these resolutions of the Winnipeg convention were the foundation for this change of front on the part of the Government. My hon. friends opposite applauded too soon. I want to tell them that before the Liberal members of this Parliament went to the Winnipeg convention they had a conference in the precincts of this House, and passed certain win-the-war resolutions, which were supposed to be the basis of a resolution that we hoped would be adopted by the Winnipeg convention. In that resolution, which was given to the press by my hon. friend from South Wellington (Mr. Guthrie), there was not a single word of reference to compulsion or conscription, except that the idea was implied, just as it is implied in the win-the-war resolution passed by the Winnipeg convention. We reached that understanding by common agreement. I am sure hon. gentlemen will not question the good faith of my hon. friend from Red Deer on this point, who I am sorry is not in his seat to confirm what I say. But he was the man who in our little caucus in the precincts of this House was absolutely set and opposed to having the word compulsion or conscription in a win-the-war resolution, because he said the object should not be to emphasize the idea of compulsion or conscription, but to emphasize the idea of national service. It was because of that agreement reached by the Liberal members of this House who voted for the Military Service Bill, that the word compulsion or conscription was deliberately kept out of the resolution, although the idea was implied in it. I have the resolutions adopted by the so-called Conscriptionist Liberals in this House before the Winnipeg convention was held. On that basis the Resolutions Committee of the Winnipeg Liberal convention agreed unanimously on the win-the-war resolution, with the exception that my hon. friend from Assiniboia moved his amendment in committee. He could not find a seconder, however, because every member of that committee, every conscriptionist member of that committee, felt that the resolution covered everything that was necessary to secure Canada's maximum effort for the winning of the war.

In moving his amendment the hon. member for Assiniboia (Mr. Turriff) deliberately —I will not say maliciously, because you would rule me out of order, Sir—broke faith with his colleagues in this House and with his colleagues on the Resolutions Committee in Winnipeg, when he went on the floor of the convention and moved his amendment to the second clause of the win-the-war resolution. His amendment could not be accepted, for the reason that we could not submit to its implication that we were passing a win-the-war resolution which did not mean everything it said. If that resolution is the reason why the men on this side of the House who voted for the Military Service Bill are to have a large number of their constituents disfranchised, then I say we have obtained a very raw deal from the present Government.

Mr. McCREA: What else could you expect?

Mr. NEELY: In my judgment, the present measure negatives the sincerity of every effort that has been made by the Prime Minister in the weeks and months gone by for the formation of a National Government in this country, because the right hon. gentleman knows that he cannot secure representative men from western Canada at all events to enter his Government and pass such a measure as this and put it on the statute books. It is true he may secure the support of certain members on this side of the House, but they are very few, and I want to say further, that if they are so secured, those men no longer represent Liberalism in this House or in the country, because they not only have voted with the Government on the Military Service Bill, but they have voted with the Government to force through Parliament by closure every autocratic measure they could devise. I say these men have ceased to be representatives of Liberalism in this House or in this country, and a Government that included them would in no sense be representative of the great Liberal party throughout Canada. To my mind the effect of this measure has negatived the sincerity of the efforts of the Prime Minister to secure what he calls union or national government. The first blow he gave to that movement was when he sent Sir Clifford Sifton West to mobilize the sentiment of western Canada in favour of the proposition of a national government. I am told that that hon. gentleman had even portfolios in his pocket which he was prepared and authorized to submit to certain western leaders if they

could be secured for the formation of a national government.

Sir ROBERT BORDEN: The hon. gentleman's statement is absolutely inaccurate. I did not send Sir Clifford Sifton West; he went entirely of his own initiative, and so far as I am aware he had not the promise of any portfolio to any one.

Mr. NEELY: The country will be very glad to know that, because the people failed to understand why preceding that Winnipeg convention Sir Clifford Sifton made it a point to go West and make the speeches he did. Evidently he had the blessing of the Prime Minister, if he had not his actual endorsation or authority. I may tell you that the West has no use for Sir Clifford Sifton. The people believe he betrayed them in 1911, and so far as he is concerned the West is short on faith and long on memory. I think I have almost reached the limit of my time, although there were some interruptions. I presume there is no hope the present Government will abandon this measure. I wish to say to this House that I go back to my constituents with shame and sorrow in my heart.

Some hon. MEMBERS: Oh, oh.

Mr. NEELY: That is the way with hon. gentlemen opposite. They often go off at half cock. I go to my constituents with shame and sorrow in my heart that any representative body of men in Canada, let alone this Parliament, should mete out to innocent men such a measure of injustice as this Bill proposes. The people I speak for are in every respect law-abiding citizens, who have given freely of their substance for war effort, and who have refused no form of national service; nevertheless they are disfranchised, and their political rights are taken away without any pretext that hides a purely partisan motive. I make my protest, and if it were the last word I should speak in this Parliament—

Some hon. MEMBERS: Oh, oh.

Mr. NEELY: —but it is not going to be, and hon. gentlemen need not worry about that. If it were the last word I were to speak in this Parliament I would declare that this measure is unjust, unBritish, autocratic, and damnable to the very last degree.

Some hon. MEMBERS: Order.

Some hon. MEMBERS: Take it back.

Mr. SPEAKER: I think the hon. gentleman should withdraw the last adjective. It is not properly used.

[Mr. Neely.]

Mr. NEELY: Then, I withdraw it, but I looked in Webster and I find the meaning of the word "damnable" is "worthy of condemnation."

Mr. SPEAKER: It would be better to use the expression "worthy of condemnation."

Mr. NEELY: Therefore, to make my protest effective, I beg to move the following amendment:

That the said Bill be not now read a third time, but that it be again referred to the Committee of the Whole with instructions that they have power to amend it by eliminating from it all such provisions as tend to remove the franchise from any class of His Majesty's subjects who are now qualified electors according to the laws of the province in which they reside.

Mr. SPEAKER: The question is on the amendment.

Mr. GAUTHIER (Saint-Hyacinthe) (Translation): Mr. Speaker, I shall improve the twenty minutes, allowed to us by the rules of this House to express my views upon the Bill now under discussion, and also upon the proposed amendment. I shall make my observations as concise as possible and I wish to enter my most formal protest against this piece of legislation submitted to us.

To give emphasis to the views I entertain, I may say that the present Bill is the last born of a whole family originating and conceived in the most absolute iniquity; that it is worthy of its authors and also that it does not disown its elders.

The Bill under discussiion is iniquitous by the fact it grants the electoral franchise as it does. It is doubly iniquitous because it takes away that same franchise from those who now are entitled to it. Let me use the comparison which has already been instituted on several occasions in this House. It has been said that the franchise legislation laid before this Parliament would be worthy of the German Kaiser. I think it is doing an injustice to the Kaiser, to compare him to this Government.

The German Kaiser, Mr. Speaker, fights in broad daylight; he sticks to the conviction that in order to maintain his Empire, might conquers right; he does not hide himself, but fights in the open. And to show to what extent he is imbued with that doctrine, he does not fear to take the offensive. For that principle, he struggles, although the majority of his people complain that the populations are dispersed, the territories devastated, but he, the emperor of Germany, knowing that this

principle is at the very root of his power, scoffs at the civilized world and faces, so to say, the whole world. He has let loose upon mankind a beast which he had unmuzzled and it will require the united efforts of civilization to overcome the ferocious animal Now, Mr. Speaker, is there not some grandeur in that act?

Everyone hopes that Prussianism, such as it has been created by the Kaiser and those who surround him, shall be some day crushed; but we must nevertheless give it that credit that it fights for a principle and that it has the courage of facing its enemies.

Now, what do we see in this House? The most iniquitous measures, the most unjust and the most outrageous to the liberty of the citizens, are introduced into Parliament and in what way? As the sponsor for such a Bill, they pick out the man with the softest, the mellowest voice, a real eunuch's voice, might I say to express its full justness and sweetness. Well! I shall denounce that Act for just what it is. It is the worst legislation ever submitted to this Parliament. The Alsatians and the Lorraines have had to bear the yoke of Germany during forty-seven years; they have incessantly longed for the coming of the French armies and, in this heroic war, overflowing with memorable facts, no action has gone more quickly to the heart than that visit of General Joffre to Alsace and Lorraine, at the head of his victorious armies. That illustrious general thought he could do nothing better than to put a kiss upon the burgomaster's cheek, saying: "This kiss I give you, I give it to you in the name of France—you will again become French."

Well, Mr. Speaker, is it not pushing irony to its extreme limit to say to these gentlemen who originally came from Alsace and Lorraine, who bear impressed on their features and in their hearts that nobleness characteristic of the French race: "You are German subjects and, by virtue of this Act, you no longer have any voice in Canada's business management." Is it not the same for the Slavs and the Moravians, whose fellow citizens are still groaning under the yoke of Austria-Hungary? Their eyes and their hearts are turned towards the Allies, anxiously expecting the blessed hour of deliverance; but because they are weighed down under the foe's oppression, are they to be denied their rights? And what is to be said of the Italians born in the Trentino or Triest? At her very entering into the conflict, Italy sent her armies towards these provinces; her soldiers crossed the Alps and sprang to the relief of their brothers crushed under the yoke of Austria-Hungary.

Technically, they are our foes, but all their aspirations, all their hope rest upon the Allies' victory. These are the people you are treating as enemies, by disfranchising them, and that for the only reason that Providence has willed that they be born within a territory that happened to be under the domination of Austria-Hungary. Mr. Speaker, this is an iniquity from beginning to end, but I may immediately add that it does not surprise me.

The Government are to-day forging the last link of the chain around their necks and we intend to use that chain, not to strangle them, but to drag them before the bar of public opinion. In spite of all the Prussian laws and all the iniquities committed by the authors of those laws, which have no other object but the muzzling of the people, public conscience will rise; there will be a start among the people and the Government will pay the penalty for the injustice they are to-day committing by disfranchising citizens whose only wrong is of having been born in enemy territory. These citizens, anxious to have a place under the sun of freedom, went into exile and came to our shores, trusting our rulers' good faith when they told them, through their agents, that, should they comply with certain obligations, they would enjoy the same privileges as the native Canadians. They wanted to escape from a tyrannic government, and believing that freedom reigned here, they came over to Canada.

They have found it so, they have had it until now. When they decided to leave their native land in order to enjoy liberty, they came and settled here in order to help us in developing Canada; but they will find out that, even in Canada, there are still people who do not hesitate in laying their hands upon individual liberty, and denying to citizens of this country their rights. Why? Because, in certain quarters, it is believed that those people might vote against the Government.

Mr. Speaker, if the present Government had the courage of the German Kaiser, to whom its members have been compared, they would have framed a very simple Bill; an explicative clause, and then an organic one.

The explicative section would have stated: the word "person" means the whole male and female population of Canada;

Section first and only section: "Every person believed to be in favour of the Government shall have the right to vote and all the others shall be denied that right."

It is plain sailing, as you see. But no, that would have smacked too much of Prus-

sianism; and these gentlemen have a refined Prussianism of their own.

They want to befool the people they are about to disfranchise, into the belief that they are doing them an actual service by denying them the franchise; those, at least, who have approved or condemned the Administration who are about to go before the country, they had the right to vote, and that right is taken away from them. Why are they denied their franchise? Ah, Sir, for a very simple reason: the Government wants to stand by the Tory doctrine. The Tory party believe they have the absolute right to rule mankind; it is their divine right to administer public affairs and when, unfortunately, they are turned out of office, we all recall their moanings and their groanings. Had they both the courage and the power, they would enact that never must the Liberal party aspire to administer the affairs of the country, because the country's affairs, just as its citizens, must be the absolute property of the Tory party. And the present Bill only reflects the light which strikes those who are now ruling us.

Mr. Speaker, the women of this country, who did not ask the franchise, have it given to them. Upon what principle? Is it to replace the soldiers' vote? Oh, no! If however, they had said: every man who has risked his life to go and defend the country, to fight for the triumph of Liberty, Justice and Civilization, should have a proxy in order that, when the day of voting shall come, he may be heard from and, if he has made the supreme sacrifice and his body lies buried somewhere in the soil of old Europe, that he may have a proxy who will express, in his name, his approval or his disapproval of the Government we have had for the past six years.

Not only shall the soldier vote, but all the women of his family are enfranchised. The Government are carrying things to such extremes that they do not hesitate to enact class legislation; the Government, instead of enacting have from the standpoint of public interest are resorting to expedients in order to get another lease of power.

Had I the time to do it, Mr. Speaker, I using the language which you seem to understand so well, I should like to emphasize, the comparison I wish to institute with regard to these hon. gentlemen.

Every man, on his deathbed, looks back to his past life, with remorse and regrets his errors; the adulterer remembers with distress the wrong done to his wife; the thief laments having taken his neighbour's goods; the drunkard remembers with sorrow the ruin he has heaped up during his lifetime, the wrong done to his wife and children, and on his dying bed, he wishes he could get a longer lease of life and turn over a new leaf.

There is only one being in the world who, upon his dying day, is impervious to remorse. It is the gambler. He also regrets life, not in order to change his ways for the better, should he begin life over again, but that he might again feel all his heart-strings quiver, all his fibres move and feel the full delight of handling the gold he risks and of heaping up the gold he wins from his gaming companions.

The Government is like unto the gambler. The Government is impervious to remorse for, to feel remorse, one must have a conscience, and this Government has no conscience, it can have no remorse. I say that this Bill shows it to the eyes of the people such as it actually is and far from demanding that it be voted down and thrown out or amended, I say: Let it stand such as it is, let it be crystallised into law, and the future generations will say that, in the year of our Lord 1917, this country was unfortunate in being ruled by an Administration steeped in Toryism to an extent unprecedented in the history of this country.

Mr. ETHIER (Two Mountains) (translation): Mr. Speaker, just as I have entered my protest against the passage of the Compulsory Military Service Act, which the Government have imposed upon the country, but which they have not yet attempted to put into force—a thing which, I hope, they will have no occasion to do before the coming general elections so that it may remain in the statutes of 1917 as a dead letter,—just as I did put on record my protest against the no less iniquitous Act for the acquisition of the capital stock of the Canadian Northern, so do I believe it my duty, again to-day, in spite of the closure rule, although a servile majority has been ready, for days and weeks, to endorse every iniquity of the autocratic Government we have, in spite of all the crushing arguments brought forward to prevent that Act becoming law, I believe it is my duty to register once more my protest against such measures.

Upon the second reading of this Bill, I gladly voted against that second reading and in favour of the amendment moved by the hon. leader of the Opposition. It was with the same pleasure and conviction that I registered my vote in favour of the amendment proposed by the hon. member for

St. John (Mr. Pugsley). The amendment moved by the hon. leader of the Opposition reads as follows:

"That this Bill be not now read a second time but that it be resolved, that the abridgment by this Parliament of the electoral franchise now enjoyed in any province of the Dominion by any class of His Majesty's subjects would be contrary to the peace, order and good government of Canada."

I say that I have voted in the country's interest, generally, and in that of my constituents in particular, when I registered my vote—in spite of the entreaties of the hon. Prime Minister and of those who so slavishly follow him—in favour of the amendment moved by the hon. member for St. John and which contained two points, to wit:

That the said Bill be not now read a second time but that it be resolved, that in the opinion of this House it is not desirable, as provided by the said Bill, to disfranchise large numbers of people of Canada who have taken the oath of allegiance, have been guaranteed the rights of citizenship in the name of His Majesty the King, and who have not failed to discharge all the obligations of citizenship;

And further that it be resolved that any measure granting the franchise only to a limited number of women, as proposed by the Bill, is contrary to the public interest, and fails to recognize the splendid patriotic work which has been performed by the women of Canada generally during the present war

I again contend that, although siding with the minority of this House, we are however voting with the majority of the people and that, in moving this amendment, the hon. member for St. John was only voicing the sentiments of the Canadian people.

Mr. Speaker, the Bill which is called the "The War-time Elections Act", should more properly by known as The Election-time Vote Making Act. Such a title would be justifiable, since from the wording of this Act the Government has the right to make votes by extending the electoral franchise to a certain class of the female population, believing that by adding to the electoral lists the names of 400,000 extra voters, it may still have in the next Parliament a majority just as truly and servilely at its command as the one it has to-day.

They think they can justify this Bill by saying that it is for the Empire's welfare that the mothers, daughters and sisters of the soldiers be granted the franchise. They also state, to justify that iniquity, that it is a case of justice to grant them such a right. It seems to me Mr. Speaker, that there is a far more practical way of doing justice to them.

In 1915, when the Government brought down a Bill giving the soldiers the right to vote, we did not object to the passing of that Bill, but I wonder why the Government have seen fit to further extend that right, after the recent experience of British Columbia and the rather distressing consequences that have resulted from it.

If the Government want at any cost to do justice to the mothers, wives and daughters of our soldiers, there is, I repeat it, a far more practical way of doing so; it would be by assisting them in a pecuniary manner. As a matter of principle, I am opposed to extending the franchise to women; however, this is a debatable question and, on that point, my own opinion is that women in general and mothers have a nobler part to play than to meddle with our political life and serve the interests of certain politicians too often untrustworthy. It seems to me that a splendid way to aid the mothers, wives or daughters of our soldiers, would be to increase the pensions granted them in 1914. The conditions are no longer the same that existed at that time; indeed, the cost of living has increased from 50 to 60 per cent, I might even say 100 per cent, and yet the mother, whose only support has enlisted, draws to-day from the Government the same pension, which is $20 for a private, $25 for sergeant, $30 for a lieutenant, $40 for a capitain, $50 for a major and $60 for a lieutenant-colonel. Well, Mr. Speaker, why not give the woman an increase in her pension proportionate to that in the cost of living? Is it just that a man who is exposing his life in the interest of the Empire and of civilization, should only leave his wife or his mother, whose sole support he is, the paltry sum of $20 a month? If the Government means to do something for those mothers, let it start in by increasing that pension which to-day is a derisive one. Should it do this, I am sure those women would not ask anything else.

The Government imagines that the women, whose names shall be put on the electoral list, will vote for it; for my part, I am sure of the contrary and the coming elections will show you that the vast majority are against this Government.

To justify this Bill, the Government has seen fit to recall the sacrifices those women have accomplished, and that it was only fair that this privilege be granted them. If, Mr. Speaker, this Act is fair towards this class of women, is it not unfair for another class still more numerous? Women and young girls have sacrificed themselves since 1914, have ruined their health in the mills and in the munition shops; others have worked night and day to help our

soldiers, and lastly, others again have given their time and their energy for the success of all kinds of works in order to relieve the Belgians, the French, in the regions laid waste, as welle as the Poles and the Serbians. Is it not unfair, Mr. Speaker, to refuse them a privilege which is granted to others?

By virtue of the second part of this Bill, British citizens are deprived of their right to take part in the country's affairs, a right they had acquired by their labour, and that because they fear that the great majority of those voters might declare themselves against the present Government. That Act, Mr. Speaker, is worthy of another country than the one we live in. It is not in conformity with the liberties of which the British flag is the emblem. To judge such an Act at its value, we must recall that the citizens who are to be disfranchised came into this country more than fifteen years ago, that they have contributed to its development by their labour, and moreover that, since their coming here, they have contributed their full share to the administration's expenditure and to the war expenditure. But you do not hesitate to commit such an injustice.

Mr. RAINVILLE (presiding) (translation): I wish to point out to the hon. member that Parliamentary procedure demands that he address himself to the Chair.

Mr. ETHIER (translation): Mr. Speaker, by depriving these citizens of their right to vote, the Government are in direct contradiction with the Act they caused to be passed in 1914 concerning naturalization. In 1914, the Government saw fit to amend the Naturalization Act by stipulating that the period of residence required from an alien should be five instead of three years, if I remember well; and, on the other hand, wishing to give these aliens more extensive rights, it was provided—what did not exist in the Naturalization Act—that, in the future, all citizens naturalized under this Act would have all the rights of British citizens throughout the British Empire. To those people, who have been naturalized for three years, were given the rights of Imperial citizens and it is those very rights they want to take away from them to-day.

Those who have become naturalized have taken the oath of allegiance, they have sworn fealty to the King of England. But, if these gentlemen have taken an oath, they have the right, in return, that the pledge given by the British Crown—when the civil courts granted their request by which they asked to become British citizens—they have the right, I say, to expect that the pledges made by the British Crown be respected. What is that pledge? The very text which the judge reads, in His Majesty's name, to the naturalized citizen, is as follows:

> This is therefore, to certify to all whom it may concern that, under and by virtue of the said Act, the said A. B. has become naturalized as a British subject and is, within Canada, entitled to all the political and other rights, powers and privileges, and subject to all obligations to which a natural-born British subject is entitled.

What do they now do with that pledge? They go back on it, they repudiate it, they treat it as a scrap of paper. It is worthy of the Teuton spirit, it is worthy of the Boche spirit, which seems to especially animate, for some weeks past, the hon members opposite and the present Cabinet. Mr. Speaker, is it fair to disfranchise 50,000 citizens who will not have the advantage of being able to say, when the people of the Dominion will be called upon to judge the Government, that they condemn the methods which have characterized the present Administration and especially the Militia Department, since the inception of the war?

With their "Win-the-War" cry, the Government believe they can make the electorate forget all their turpitude since 1911; they think they can thus cause the people to forget all the scandals which have marked their passing upon the ministerial benches and which have defiled Canada's political history; but the electorate will have their revenge.

Will those whom you are disfranchising be called upon to pay the $600,000,000 which the Government has borrowed to meet the war liabilities? Will those forty or fifty thousand disfranchised citizens be asked to pay the income tax which the Minister of Finance has put in the statute books during this session? Will they be exempted from paying the pension funds to the families of the soldiers who have fallen on the fields of honour and for the disabled soldiers now returned or for those who will come back after the war? No, and yet all their rights are taken away from them. They take away their right to say what they think of the present Administration, and still they will compel them to pay.

There is another clause in the Bill which is also an iniquity, that which says that the man who will not answer the call, under the Compulsory Military Service Act, will lose his right to vote.

Yes, this is another iniquity of the reign of terror, of the reign of despotism and, in

spite of the efforts of my hon. friend, the member for Three Rivers (Mr. Bureau), the Government would not listen to his suggestions, they bring us back to the Elections Act previous to 1896, to the old institution of revisors which the Laurier Government had abolished. However, the Franchise Act has better operated in the country since 1896 than under the old Chapleau Act.

Instead of leaving the preparation of this list, created by this nefarious Bill, in the hands of competent persons, such as the municipal secretary-treasurers—I refer to the province of Quebec—an enumerator shall be needed, not only in every voting district, but in every polling division, as stated in section 42 (1) of the Bill as amended.

This section 42 (1) reads as follows:

Subject to the provisions of section 65A of this Act, the Governor in Council may appoint enumerators in each province to make lists of the electors in each electoral district, and the returning officer of each electoral district shall assign one of such enumerators to each polling division therein: by inserting between the words "such" and "appointments" in the first line of subsection (2) of said section the words "or sufficient", and by striking out of the ninth line of said subsection (2) of said section the words "one or more polling divisions" and inserting instead the words "polling division;" by striking out from the fourth line of subsection (1) of section 46 the words "or each of the polling divisions" and by adding as subsections (2) and (3) to said section the following.

It is evident that the returning officer, who will be a creature of the Government, will appoint an enumerator of his own choice, who may himself operate the machinery to suit his taste, in the hands of his creatures—and they call that "fair play." Thus, in the rural counties, if there is one with four polling divisions, there will be four enumerators. The provincial Act works well; the federal Act has worked well since 1896, and the preparing of the lists was in the hands of the secretary-treasurers. In the province of Quebec, in September, the secretary-treasurers have completed the electoral list for every polling division. From September 15 to 30, those who find they have been wronged may complain, have the required corrections made and the municipal council, after September 30, if there are any complaints, must revise the electoral list, from October 1 to October 15. This costs nothing to the country and it is done by competent parties. You know those facts, Mr. Speaker.

Upon the whole, I say that this iniquitous and unjust Bill will be a cause for corruption in the making out of the lists and in the application of this Act.

Mr. Speaker, I bow down, my time is up, I am done.

At six o'clock the House took recess.

After Recess.

The House resumed at eight o'clock.

Mr. E. PROULX (Prescott): Mr. Speaker, when this war was declared, about three years ago, all classes in this country responded to the call of the Government to enlist and go across the ocean to help Great Britain and her Allies. There was no distinction of race or creed in the call or in the response. No opposition was offered by any party in this country to the participation of Canada in the war. When the first war session was called in August, 1914, the Liberal party unanimously supported the policy of the Government and voted the money asked for by the Government to equip, organize and send the troops across the seas. Now the Government propose to disfranchise some of the people who responded to that call. If they did not answer the call by enlisting, they answered it by contributing generously to the Patriotic Fund, the Red Cross Fund, and other patriotic works. Shortly after the outbreak of the war I remember hearing the right hon. the Prime Minister (Sir Robert Borden) express his belief that people of Austrian and German extraction would be loyal to the British flag and to the country of their adoption. Nothing has happened since to change that opinion and belief of the Prime Minister. There have been no acts committed by those subjects whom this Bill seeks to disfranchise to lead Parliament to believe that they do not deserve the rights of British citizens. I had always believed that citizenship carried with it the right and privilege of the suffrage. The first case which determined that point, as I remember, was the case of Ashby vs. White. In that case an elector was refused the right to cast his vote, by a returning officer, and he sued the returning officer for the restitution of his right. Under the common law in England it was decided that there was no infringement of rights without a remedy, and the court rendered judgment against the deputy returning officer, and declared that the right of the elector had been infringed, because British citizenship carries with it the right of determining who shall govern the country, and how its affairs

shall be administered. Some of the subjects whom it is proposed to dispossess of the franchise came to Canada fifteen, twenty-five or thirty years ago. They did not all become naturalized immediately. Some of them came from the United States. They had been Americanized before they were Canadianized. They had learned the benefits and blessings of representative institutions. They had agreed to respect the American constitution and then afterwards the Canadian constitution, which is framed on the British constitution. They have worked for and increased the wealth of their adopted country. They had been invited by this Government to come here in large numbers. The countries of Europe were scoured by our immigration agents to find people to come and settle the unsettled plains of the western provinces. Now, Mr. Speaker, for political purposes, for the purpose of retaining power, the Government propose to infringe the most sacred rights of citizenship and to disfranchise a large class of people who have shown themselves to be loyal, who have shown that they love the country of their adoption, and some of whom have offered their services as soldiers in the armies of the Allies. Those who have not offered their services have given largely of their means to help the cause. I remember that when it was rumoured that a Franchise Bill would be presented by the Government to disfranchise a certain number of people in this country, one of the principal organs of the Government, the Montreal Gazette, discouraged the Government from bringing such a measure before the House and condemned any measure of disfranchisement. Another of the principal organs of the Government, the Mail and Empire of Toronto, in an article published on the 7th of this month, justified this measure only on the plea that the Liberals had opposed the extension of Parliament and had refused to join in a union or national government. That is the only excuse offered by that journal for this action of the Government. One of the principal newspapers of this country, which, though not usually supporting the Government has been supporting it on the Military Service Bill and other important measures, strongly condemns this Bill. In an article which appeared on the 7th of this month, the Toronto Globe had this to say:

The Disfranchising Bill.

The War-Time Election Bill is a party measure. The attack on the political rights of a large group of foreign-born Canadians is tempered by their exemption from combatant service, but the principle of the Bill is wrong. It is inconsistent with national honour and British traditions. When men of alien birth were given their naturalization papers they were also given the full privileges of Canadian citizenship. It was a contract to which the good faith of the country was pledged. The Bill will cancel the chief article of the contract, the franchise, without proof that the voter has forfeited it by conduct unbecoming a patriotic Canadian. The presumption of innocence until guilt be proved, which underlies the common law, is reversed. It is true that the disability applies only to men who have been naturalized within the past fifteen years, but the country offered them the franchise three years after their arrival, in order to hasten the process of Canadianizing them. It is now proposed to deprive them of the badge of citizenship.

The Bill is aimed at the large element in the West of German and Austrian birth. These men came to Canada to escape the conditions of life in their native lands, and they came upon the invitation of the Canadian people, whose agents scoured Europe for immigrants to till the empty prairies. They have added immeasurably to the wealth of the country. During the war they have given no trouble as a class; one hears no echo among them of the seditious propaganda of Teutons across the line. Many are Ukrainians—the Galician branch of the family—whose sympathies, formerly with Austria, though never troublesomely so, have turned to Russia since the Revolution, which has given a new hope and vision to their race in Europe. Disfranchisement will be only for the period of the war, but the memory of it will survive for a generation, and will tend to undo the great work of assimilation carried on by the schools, the churches, and, not least, by the ballot, the pledge of their civil and political equality. The Bill is therefore not good national policy. It is more German than Canadian or British in its character.

I think this Bill and its provisions are very well characterized by this article of the Globe. It is my belief that this is not a Bill which is fathered by the Prime Minister (Sir Robert Borden) or even by the Minister of Trade and Commerce (Sir George Foster). I believe that my right hon. friends, the Prime Minister and the Minister of Trade and Commerce, who come from the Maritime Provinces, who were reared in the provinces bathed by the sea, who have breathed the freedom of those provinces and of Canada, would not be guilty of such an infringement of British and Canadian rights. I rather ascribe this measure to the Secretary of State (Mr. Meighen). He comes from the West, and in the West, well, they take chances—they are more addicted to gambling; they do things that are not done in the eastern provinces. I believe that this is a penalizing measure, and that if the negotiations for a union and national government had succeeded the measure, would not have been introduced. But as these negotiations

did not succeed, I believe the Secretary of State brought this measure before the House with a vengeance, he wanted to get even with those infernal Grits of the West who did not want to join with this Government. The Liberals of the West would not join with this Government, especially after they introduced their measure to purchase the shares of the Canadian Northern railway, and to punish them, the Secretary of State has brought in this measure to decrease the strength of the Liberal party in the West. As the member for Edmonton (Mr. Oliver) said this afternoon, this measure is a menace to the union and to harmony between the races in this country; it is going to create disunion and discord. We had union and harmony until this year, but by the Military Service Act and the Soldiers' Voting Act, and now by this nefarious Bill, the union and harmony of this country are again threatened. Not only are they threatened, but the union is disrupted, and will remain disrupted, probably, for many years to come.

The Government say that this measure is only for the time of the war. But the war may end next year and Parliament will still be elected for five years. There will be important questions after the war which will affect the people whom this Bill disfranchises as well as those who retain the right of the franchise. A very considerable war debt will be contracted, and this debt will have to be paid, if not the capital at least the interest. The money will have to be got somewhere from somebody. The people disfranchised by this Bill will not be exempt from taxation, but they will have no voice in the election of members of this Parliament. This Parliament will be elected for five years, and if the war ends next year they will be sitting for four years without these people having had one word to say in the election of their members and the framing of the policies of the Government. Not only the right of franchise, but also the principle that there should be no taxation without representation will be infringed upon. That is a principle which has been held sacred in all British countries—that there should be no taxation without representation. It has always been held sacred in Canada. In the municipalities you would not think of taxing a person without giving him a vote and a voice in the election of members of the municipal council. These people will have to pay the income tax, and the customs tariff tax, and they will have to put war stamps on the patent medicines they buy and on the cheques or promissory notes they issue, just as do other citizens. They will not be exempt from war taxes, but still they will have nothing to say in the administration of the affairs of the country. Two great principles always recognized by the British constitution, the right of the suffrage with British citizenship and the principle that there shall be no taxation without representation, are violated by this Bill.

There is one feature of the Bill which particularly I do not like. When we were in committee the Secretary of State said that the enumerators who are to prepare the lists will be appointed by the deputy returning officers. I suggested then that these enumerators should be appointed by the judges, as some of the members of the local tribunals under the Military Service Act are appointed. We know that those appointed by the Government are usually friendly to the Government, and oftentimes partisan. The Secretary of State said they would be appointed by the deputy returning officers, who, as a rule, are fair. I believe that, as a general rule, the deputy returning officers are fair; but the deputy returning officers do not prepare the lists. By reading the Bill, I see that the minister did not fairly state the position. The enumerators are not appointed by the deputy returning officers, but by the Governor in Council. That means that they will be recommended by the sitting member or the defeated candidate, the person who has control of the patronage, and the Secretary of State on this recommendation will appoint them. All that the deputy returning officers will do is to assign their work to them. We have no guarantee that they will even be residents of the municipalities in which they will do the work. The hon. member for Three Rivers (Mr. Bureau) wanted to have it inserted in the Bill that those appointed should be resident, and should be the secretary-treasurers of the municipalities in Quebec, as they are familiar with all the electors; and some members from Ontario also suggested that the municipal clerks of Ontario should be appointed enumerators. But the Secretary of State would not accept any of those suggestions, although they were fair— and the Government pretends that it wants to be fair, that it wants fair enumerators and a fair list. If it wants to be fair, why will it not accept the suggestions made by hon. members on this side and have impartial men appointed as enumerators so as to insure a fair enumeration and a fair list?

My hon. friend from Three Rivers asked the Secretary of State to assure us that these men would be qualified. We have no assurance that they will be qualified. I believe the only qualification will be that these men must be friendly to the Government. That will certainly be their main qualification. I say that these officials will have too much discretion and too much latitude. They can take names off the list, as well as add names to it. On what evidence will they take names off the list? There is no provision in the Bill in regard to that. They will take the Ontario lists prepared in 1916. The Bill does not provide that they shall hear evidence, but they will use their own discretion, and take names from the list for certain reasons. If these officials are partisans, they will perhaps act unjustly. In order to secure the benefit of the vote of those men whose names are taken off the list, the voters will have to appear before a judge and testify. Their vote will only be received on a recount, after their right to vote has been established before a judge. I think the Secretary of State should have accepted some of the suggestions made on this side of the House, and should have given us an assurance that the enumerators would be fair men, and that a proper list would be prepared, for a fair list is the very basis of an election. The Government should not load the dice. The Government has secured enough advantage by the passing of the Soldiers' Votes Bill, and the provision that these votes may be distributed to any county the voters designate. The provision permitting the bunching of the votes gives them enough advantage, without giving the enumerator the right to take voters from the list. I should like to make further remarks about this Bill, but those who follow me will be able to show many deficiencies in the Bill and I certainly intend to vote for the amendment and against the motion for third reading.

Mr. W. G. WEICHEL (North Waterloo): Many measures have been introduced into this House since Canada's participation in the war commenced, but I venture to say to-night that none apart from the Military Service Bill, created a greater interest throughout the country than the present Franchise Bill. It is a pity that there is a necessity at all for introducing a measure of this kind. I don't wish to put all the blame on other men's shoulders, but I cannot view the matter in any other light than that the blame for the introduction of the present Franchise Bill must be placed on the shoulders of the present Opposition,

because, had they agreed to an extension of the life of Parliament, as the country demanded, and had we had coalition or union government, the necessity of this Bill would absolutely have been obviated. I wish to say a few words with regard to the measure in its present form, and I do not wish to follow my hon. friend from Prescott (Mr. Proulx), as my line of thought will lead me in a different direction. I am greatly in favour of the feature in this Bill which provides for the granting of female suffrage to the relatives of the soldiers at the front. I have been in different parts of Canada, and have never yet met with any man or woman who was not greatly in favour of this particular section which grants suffrage to the wives and other relatives of the soldiers at the front. The Secretary of State (Mr. Meighen), in so ably describing the measure the other day, stated that the basis of franchise was service and sacrifice. We all know what sacrifices have been made by the men who have left the soil of Canada during the last three years. We know that 30,000 of these brave men lie buried in France, and that thousands of them are to-day prisoners in the prison camps in Germany, suffering untold hardships, no doubt. We also know that others, on account of doing special military service, will not be privileged to vote during this election campaign. We must not forget that the personality of a man in his own district counts for a great deal during an election campaign; and that personality to-day, owing to the fact that these men cannot be with us, is missing, and, therefore, I think a thousand considerations are being pressed home, that these men should be protected by someone here who can speak on their behalf. And that is being provided for by the Bill. I have heard several gentlemen on the opposite side of the House state that the women of this country feel insulted, because the Bill does not provide universal franchise for all the women of Canada. I have never heard anything of the kind in this country, and I believe I have travelled as much as most men in this House. In fact, I know that the women of this country are in perfect accord with the Bill in its present form, and, to prove that, I will take the liberty of reading a despatch which appeared in this morning's Journal-Press, dated Toronto, September 13. It reads:

A letter signed by Mrs. F. H. Torrington, Mrs. Albert Gooderham, Mrs. E. Stevens, and Mrs. L. A. Hamilton, and referring to the War-Time Election Bill, has been issued:

The ladies subscribing to the letter represent the National Equal Franchise Union, the Daughters of the Empire, the National Council of Women, and the Ontario W.C.T.U. The letter says:

"The result of numerous enquiries convinced these women that, considering the peculiar conditions which prevail at the present time in certain provinces and the uncertainty of the results in granting a full franchise, it would be desirable that a limited franchise should be given as a war measure in order that Canada may do her full part in the war and remain true to her sacred trust to the Canadian men now fighting the battle of freedom."

That resolution, coming from four of the most representative bodies of the women of Canada, proves conclusively, in my opinion at least—and I believe in the opinion of this House—that the Bill in its present shape is being received with favour throughout every part of Canada.

The other matter that I wish to refer to is the disfranchisement of alien enemies in the Dominion. I have not been in the West often enough to be familiar with the conditions that prevail there, but I do know something about the conditions existing among the people of German origin in Ontario—and I speak only for them. Last January, in the city of Kitchener, a rather lively municipal contest was held. As a result of that contest some ninety-six old men, who had been living in my constituency for from twenty-five to thirty years, were deprived of their citizenship because they could not produce their naturalization papers. All the blame and all the responsibility should not be placed upon the shoulders of those men; many of them, by taking the oath of allegiance in former years, felt that they were British subjects. The fault must be laid at the door of the politicians of the past, on men who should have known better; on men who should have advised these people that by the taking out of naturalization papers they might become British subjects. These people who now seek naturalization were pioneers in that district. The member for Haldimand (Mr. Lalor) says "Hear, hear." I know, Sir, that many of these people live in his riding; others live in the Hurons, the Bruces, the Perths, the Renfrews, and in many other parts of Canada. These people, I have said, were pioneers in that district; they helped to build up Waterloo county, and that county, not only prior to 1914, but since the outbreak of war, is held in the highest esteem by all right-thinking men in Canada. These men hold property, they have served on juries; they have served on school boards; in some instances they have acted as aldermen. You can rest assured, Mr. Speaker, that the present situation has produced many heartaches, many hardships, among these people. Their position is entirely different from that occupied by persons of foreign origin in other parts of Canada. The people in the county of Waterloo are not clannish; they intermarry with the English, Irish and Scotch. It is true that many differ from persons in other parts of the country in respect of the names that they bear, but so long as a man keeps his name free from suspicion; so long as he allows nothing to besmirch it, there is no reason in the world why he should change it.

Permit me to point out another difference between these people and other foreigners who come into our country. Take, for instance, the class of people who come from southern Europe—every hon. gentleman in the House knows to whom I allude. They stay here for a few years; they work in the shops; they accumulate a considerable amount of money—because it does not cost them a great deal to live—and after they have accumulated a small fortune they go back to the land of their birth, as the Chinese and Japanese do. You never see them stay here; many of them, when they come, do not intend to stay here. Such is not the case with the people of German origin in my riding, who have lived there thirty or forty years. They intend to make Canada their permanent home; they intend to live and die in this country. I ask the Parliament of Canada, therefore, that people of this class who have lived in Canada from twenty-five to fifty years be given some legal status in the matter of citizenship; that they be given some standing in the community. I ask that men of this description be allowed to take out naturalization papers; that is only a matter of fair play and justice. There has been no whisper of wrongdoing on the part of these people. I know that the Minister of Justice (Mr. Doherty) will say "aye" to everything that I have said tonight about the persons of German origin in Ontario. They have conscientiously done their duty in respect of everything pertaining to the war; they have given generously to Red Cross, Belgian Relief, and Patriotic Funds. Besides doing all these things because they believed it was their duty, many of them have sent sons to the front to fight with the boys of English, Scotch and Irish extraction. My brother's second son is at the front, and the eldest has by this time enlisted. As the member for North Perth (Mr. Morphy)

stated the other evening, quite a few of these boys of German origin have given up their lives on the battlefield. These boys enlisted only because they felt that it was their duty to do so. We are proud that in the constituency of North Waterloo over 300 boys of German origin enlisted; and many of them are to-day in the trenches in France. As a matter of simple justice, as a matter of right—because these people have been here not for five or ten years, but half a century longer than many of us can remember, I ask the Prime Minister and members of this House to back me up in my simple request that these people receive some standing in the community by being granted naturalization as soon as possible.

I wish to refer to a remark made by the member for South Wellington (Mr. Guthrie) in this House the other day. He stated that at a patriotic meeting held in the little town of Elmira, he received a frigid reception. I believe that the hon. member is mistaken with regard to the sentiment that prevailed at that meeting. Elmira is my home town, my birthplace, and I think I know the people there about as well as any man does. They are not given a great deal in these days to handclapping and flag-waving, but my hon. friend's speech that night must have made a tremendous impression, because the secretary of the Patriotic Fund informed me to-day that the little town of Elmira stood almost as high as any town or village in Ontario in respect of the amount of money given. In justice, therefore, to the town of my birth, it is only fair and right that I should make this remark with respect to what the member for South Wellington said in this House. I do feel that he was entirely mistaken with regard to the sentiment that exists in that place.

I have placed my request before the Prime Minister and the members of the House; I feel that if it is granted the country will be the gainer. We must remember, Sir, that this is a cosmopolitan country. We invited these people to come here to be citizens of Canada, and they have accepted the invitation. They are here; they own property; they have tried to build up their part of the country, and in my riding they have succeeded wonderfully well in that respect. I therefore hope that the Prime Minister will see his way clear to granting some relief to these people, and I can assure him it will be very highly appreciated.

Let me read a clipping from the Detroit News of a few days ago. It is dealing with the situation across the border, which in my opinion is practically the same situation we have here, for theirs is a cosmopolitan population to a greater degree even than ours. The Detroit News says:

> Whatever has happened in the past three years, we should now begin to get our balance, and renew our trust and address ourselves to proving to our Canadian friends and fellow-citizens of German ancestry that a democracy is not merely a name, but that it has at its core a profound brotherly feeling of man for man, whatever his ancestry; that it means at root justice and fair dealing: that it means sympathy and love for those with real heart-aches; that it means mutual help and mutual service; that it means the strengthening and building of inseparable bonds of friendship and the banishment of doubts and fears; that a true democracy is a realm where each may do and must do his part for the help of all, and do that which he is qualified to do best for the upbuilding of the nation, which in plain truth means to make our neighbour wiser, stronger and better; that in thus making each citizen stronger we make the nation so powerful for right that might has no place in our life.

The conscientious objector when exemption from military service is granted is deprived of his voting privileges during the war-time election. In my riding I have many of this class, called Mennonites. I have lived among them all my lifetime and can vouch for their honesty of purpose and integrity of character. They are God-fearing people, whose faith teaches them to abstain from taking up arms. I can conscientiously say that they have lived up to their faith, and many of their leading men have intimated to me their desire not to take part in any war-time election.

Lastly, I hope that the Prime Minister may make a statement regarding the request I have placed before this House and the country.

Right Hon. Sir ROBERT BORDEN: As my hon. friend from North Waterloo (Mr. Weichel) has made a personal appeal to me in the observations which he has just addressed to the House, it is proper that I should make a statement as to the policy of the Government in such matters. The Secretary of State spoke with regard to this matter the other evening, and I have little to add to what he placed before the House on that occasion. I entirely agree with what the hon. member for North Waterloo has said with respect to the good service which have been rendered to the country by the class of citizens to whom he referred. We all know that there are no more prosperous, progressive or thriving communities in the Dominion than those which have been built up by men of German descent in those counties in the

province of Ontario to which my hon. friend has alluded. The remarks I am about to make will also have some application to certain conditions mentioned by the hon. member for Carleton (Mr. Carvell) a few days ago. It would appear that in the communities mentioned by these hon. gentlemen there are men who for twenty, thirty or forty years have been citizens of this country, and who during that period, or for the greater part of it at all events, have believed themselves entitled to exercise all the rights of British citizenship. They have voted at elections, taken the oath of allegiance, filled positions of trust and responsibility in the community, have served as aldermen and members of municipal councils; and they now find, sometimes to their surprise, that, although they have been engaged in all these national activities for many years, they have never been naturalized and have never technically acquired the rights of British citizenship.

At the commencement of the war there was correspondence with the British Government with regard to the granting of naturalization under the Act of 1914—the Act which was passed in that year both by the Parliament of the United Kingdom and by this Parliament, after a great deal of negotiation and after much discussion in both Parliaments. Hon. gentlemen will remember that under the terms of that Act naturalization is to be granted by the certificate of the Secretary of State, and not by a judicial tribunal as under the Act which was previously in force in this country. It will also be recalled that under the provisions of the previous Act the period of residence was three years instead of five, and that that Act conferred naturalization which was valid and effective in this country only, and not beyond the limits of our Dominion. The policy laid down by the British Government under the Act of 1914 was to refuse, during the period of the war, naturalization to men of alien enemy citizenship. We acquiesced in that policy, and we have hitherto acted upon it.

So far as naturalization under the law in force previously to the Act of 1914 is concerned, there has been a divergence of judicial opinion. The courts of the country were entrusted with the power of granting naturalization under that Act. In some of the courts it has been held that, notwithstanding the war, naturalization can still be granted in proper cases. Other courts have held that the existence of a state of war debarred the judges absolutely from granting naturalization to a person of enemy nationality.

The conditions in this country with regard to those who have come to Canada to make their home here are somewhat different from those which prevail in the United Kingdom, and we think that these differences of condition ought to be taken into account. The subject has been brought to our attention during recent weeks, and an Order in Council was passed only a few days ago, a copy of which will be laid on the table of the House either to-morrow or Monday. That Order in Council sets out the policy hitherto pursued will be in the ing naturalization under the Act of 1914 to persons of the class and character and residence described by my hon. friend from North Waterloo in the very interesting address which he has just given to this House. The purport of the Order in Council is this: That where men of enemy nationality have for many years resided in this country, where no exception can be taken to their character, and there is good reason for believing that their sympathies are with the Allied Powers in this war, where they have had reason to believe that they were British citizens and have exercised their rights as such, we shall depart from the principle hitherto pursued, and the Secretary of State for Canada will be prepared to grant naturalization to such persons. I am very glad to believe that this divergence from the policy hitherto pursued will be in the best interests of this country, and also that it will be appreciated by those who find themselves in the position described by my hon. friend from North Waterloo.

Sir WIFRID LAURIER: Is it the opinion of the officers of the Crown that the Governor in Council has that power under the statute?

Sir ROBERT BORDEN: Yes. It is a question of policy under the Act. While the policy of the British Government is of the character to which I have alluded, we have thought, in view of the considerations which have been brought to our attention in respect to persons falling within the description placed before the House by my hon. friend from North Waterloo, that it would be a proper departure from the policy heretofore pursued, for the Secretary of State for Canada to grant naturalization in such cases. That is the policy which will be pursued.

Mr. PUGSLEY: Will my right hon. friend allow me? As a result of this, will the present Bill be amended or any supple-

mentary legislation introduced to prevent these people from being disfranchised?

Sir ROBERT BORDEN: My hon. friend from North Waterloo (Mr. Weichel) put forward the question solely with regard to naturalization. We do not intend to alter the Bill already presented to the House. As the persons alluded to naturally feel that their status as citizens in this country has been affected by the fact that they have not been naturalized, although they have in the past exercised the rights and fulfilled the duties of British citizenship, it seems a proper and reasonable course, and a course which would be appreciated by them, if that divergence from the policy of the past to which I have alluded should now be undertaken. I entirely concur in what my hon. friend from North Waterloo has said as to the splendid efforts of these citizens of German descent in the province of Ontario in sustaining and assisting the Patriotic Fund. I very well remember that in the first appeal made on behalf of the Canadian Patriotic Fund in Canada, the citizens of Kitchener made it a point that they should surpass in their proportionate contributions any city or town in Canada. My recollection is that they pretty well succeeded in doing so. We have every appreciation of the loyalty and devotion thus displayed, and we believe that the course which I have indicated is no more than is just and fair under the circumstances.

Mr. J. G. TURRIFF (Assiniboia): Since the question of conscription was first brought into this House a few months ago, I have been endeavouring to treat all these matters in connection with winning the war as free as I possibly could of partisanship. It is a somewhat difficult position, especially as this afternoon I was made the subject of an attack by my friends on this side of the House. However, I do not pay very much attention to that. The question we are now discussing is the Franchise Act, and I look on the Franchise Act as more or less connected with winning the war.

Mr. PROULX: Winning the election, you mean.

Mr. TURRIFF: It is not necessary for any one to put words into my mouth. I know what I want to say, and I propose saying it in my own way. If I were disposed to do so, I might say that I think the winning of the election will have a great deal to do with the winning of the war. However, the question we are discussing to-

[Mr. Pugsley.]

night is the Franchise Act. I do not agree with all the features of the Franchise Bill now before the House. I can-

9 p.m.

not bring myself to believe that disfranchising anybody is a good policy or is a necessary policy for winning the war. During the local election held a short time ago in Saskatchewan, that question was up rather strongly, brought about principally by my hon. friend from North Simcoe (Mr. Currie). I took a strong stand then against disenfranchising anybody, and I do not propose to change my views on the subject, and on this occasion, in spite of the ill-natured remarks—as I take them to be—of my hon. friend from Humboldt (Mr. Neely) this afternoon, I intend to support his amendment. During this debate I have on two occasions voted in favour of the closure, and I did so feeling absolutely certain that as we are right at the closing of the term of Parliament, unless the closure were adopted this Bill would never have got through at all, and there would be no Election Act whatever, and we would be in a state of confusion. Judging by the bright speeches which have been made during the last two or three weeks under closure, better debates have taken place than when every member was given all the latitude he chose to take. My judgment is that many men on both sides of the House on this occasion have put as much into twenty minutes as would be put into an hour's and very often into two hours' discussion without closure. It seems to me when the next Parliament meets it would not be a bad idea, whichever party is in power, to take up the question of curtailing discussions in this House, and so shorten the sessions, that we may not be here six, or seven, or eight months.

This Bill, as I look at it, is more or less of a party Bill. It could not be otherwise. It is brought in by one party. I think I am fair in saying that it is introduced more for winning the war than for any advantage to the Conservative party, because if my hon. friends on the other side of the House think the Bill will help them win elections for many years to come in the West, they are labouring under a delusion. However, whose fault is it that the Bill is brought in as a party measure? I think it is only fair to say that the right hon. leader of the Government has made every effort to have a union or national Government to bring in this measure. I feel that a much better measure could have been prepared by a union or national Government. At the same time, I do not think it is the fault of

the present Government that we have not a national government to introduce this measure. In my judgment a national government would be better than any party government could possibly be during the war, and I am satisfied if we had a national government there would have been no necessity for disfranchising anybody. I would have preferred to put the matter squarely before all classes of people and take my chances. Possibly, by disfranchising certain classes of people, we may help win the war. This Bill may help elect a win-the-war government, but I am not so sure of that, and for what little advantage there may be in it I do not think it was worth while. If I understood my hon. friend from Edmonton (Mr. Oliver) rightly this afternoon, he likened us twenty-six Liberals who had voted for conscription to Judases.

Mr. OLIVER: May I correct my hon. friend? I think I made myself perfectly clear when I alluded to the offers and counter-offers that were made across the floor of the House for positions in the Cabinet. I made no allusion to men who voted according to principles.

Mr. TURRIFF: That may be what was in my hon. friend's mind, but he certainly referred to members on this side of the House, although he did not have the courage to designate them, as my hon. friend from Humboldt had.

Mr. OLIVER: I think my hon. friend's conscience is bothering him.

Mr. TURRIFF: My hon. friend from Edmonton need not worry about my conscience. If the appellation Judas can be applied to a man who votes against his party, my hon. friend from Edmonton is certainly an authority on the subject. I remember that, not so many years ago, he made these halls ring with his denunciation of the very people he is now so anxious about, and he was voting against his party, which was in power then, almost as often as he was voting with it. However, he had a perfect right to do that if he wished, and I have no objection. I do object, however, to be called a Judas because on one occasion I have differed from my leader.

My leader, the right hon. the leader of the Opposition (Sir Wilfrid Laurier), has been bigger, as we would naturally expect, than my hon. friend from Edmonton or my hon. friend from Humboldt. He said to every man on this side of the House: If you do not agree with my views, do exactly as you like. But the hon. member for Edmonton and the hon. member for Humboldt apparently think that because a member on this side of the House takes that position, he must, if possible, be driven out of the party. I usually use my own judgment and nothing they can do, one way or the other, will influence me in the slightest degree as to what position I will take on this or any other question that may happen to come up.

The hon. member for Humboldt stated this afternoon that I had broken faith with the conscription Liberals by the action I took at the Winnipeg convention. I did nothing of the kind. He also stated that my amendment to the win-the-war motion that was brought up in the convention was unanimously voted against. If he had been watching—and he was on the platform—he would have found that some hundreds of votes were given in favour of my amendment.

Mr. NEELY: What I said, and it will be found in Hansard, was that the win-the-war resolution which I proposed was voted for unanimously, not that my hon. friend's motion was voted against unanimously.

Mr. TURRIFF: I accept the correction; I may have taken it wrongly. But, certainly, I broke faith with nobody, and if the resolution which my hon. friend moved in the convention was passed unanimously, what has taken place since then in Manitoba, Saskatchewan and Alberta shows that it was not unanimous with the Liberals of the country. Mr. Speaker, I have said what I wanted to say and I do not propose, even if the twenty minutes is not up, to take up any more of the time of the House. I am against disfranchising anybody, I will vote against that and I will vote for the amendment of my hon. friend from Humboldt.

Mr. W. F. NICKLE (Kingston): Mr. Speaker, it was not my intention when I came here to-night to speak with regard to the measure which is now before the House but in view of the fact that the hon. member for Humboldt (Mr. Neely) has moved a resolution which practically means that this House is asked to express an opinion as to the wisdom or otherwise of our putting into effect legislation that has the effect of disfranchising certain foreigners, coupled with the speech of the hon. member for Assiniboia (Mr. Turriff), it becomes necessary that the attention of this House and the country should be directed for a minute or two to the tremendous

change that has taken place in Germany in relation to the naturalization of men who have left that country and to the dual nationality that their law now recognizes. The prior law in Germany with reference to naturalization was the law of 1870, by a provision of which a German lost his nationality provided he had left Germany and remained abroad without interruption for ten years. The wonderful tendency towards settlement of the German people and the pan-German scheme, which seems to have influenced that race during the last fifteen years, brought about in Germany a great change of public opinion with the result that in 1913 a new law in reference to naturalization was passed. Some of its provisions were of the most unique and startling character. The general principle of international law seems to recognize that if a man chooses to expatriate himself and assume the nationality of the country in which he settles he loses the nationality which he formerly had and becomes a citizen of the new country. For instance, the British Naturalization Act 33-34 Victoria, chapter 14, section 6 says:

Any British subject who has at any time before or may at any time after the passing of this Act when in any foreign state and not under any disability voluntarily become naturalized in such state shall from and after the time of his so having become naturalized in such foreign state be deemed to have ceased to be a British subject and to be regarded as an alien.

That recognizes the general and fundamental principle of international law that when a man loses the citizenship of one state and assumes the citizenship of another he becomes a citizen of the new country and has no further right to look to his former country for protection or assistance.

If I might direct the attention of the House to what is commonly known as the Delbrück law, which was passed in Germany in 1913, I think it will be convinced that the Germans who have come to this country, as well as those who have settled throughout the world, occupy a very different position from others who assume to become naturalized in a foreign state. Section 25 of that law reads as follows:

A German who is neither domiciled nor permanently resident in Germany loses nationality on the acquisition of a foreign nationality if the latter is acquired on his application or on the application of the husband (in the case of a married woman or legal guardian in the case of a ward.) A married woman or ward, however, only loses nationality if the conditions are fulfilled under which a discharge could be applied for in accordance with sections 18, 19.

As I previously said, the law in force in Germany, prior to the passing of this law, was that a German who had left Germany for ten years and settled in a foreign country lost his German nationality and ceased to be a citizen of Germany. This law of 1913 laid down the new principle that a German did not lost his nationality unless he took steps voluntarily to acquire a new nationality. That is consistent with the English law that I have just read to the House and is consistent with the general principle of international law recognized throughout the world. But the German law did not stop there. In keeping with the sophistical tendency of German thinking, with the principle that recognizes that wherever a German goes he must, if possible, still be regarded as a German and with the wonderful capacity of the German people for colonizing throughout the world, a second clause, paragraph 25, was enacted in the Delbrück law of 1913, which reads as follows:

A person does not lose his nationality if, before acquiring a foreign nationality, he has applied for, and received, the written permission of the competent authorities of his home state to retain his nationality. Before the grant of such permission, the German consul is to be consulted.

What does that mean? It means that a man may have left Germany since 1913, or, as a matter of fact, may have left almost ten years before and he may have lived in Canada, but if he did not voluntarily, of his own free will, become a citizen of Canada prior to the passing of this Act, he has the right to apply in Canada to become a Canadian or a British subject, and though he may become naturalized as a British or Canadian citizen, he is still regarded by the German state as a German citizen and entitled to all the rights of German citizenship and German protection.

Mr. OLIVER: Is the law that the hon. member speaks of German law or Austrian law?

Mr. NICKLE: I am quoting from the German Imperial and State Nationality Law passed on the 22nd day of July, 1913, together with a memorandum prepared by the British Embassy at Berlin, the memorandum being presented to both Houses of Parliament by command of His Majesty in March, 1914.

Mr. OLIVER: I asked because 99 per cent of the foreign settlers in the West are not from Germany but from Austria.

Mr. NICKLE: At the present moment I am dealing with my attitude towards the amendment of the hon. member for Hum-

boldt (Mr. Neely), and the reason I will vote against it is that I believe the great problem before this country to-day is the winning of this war; I believe that, in the winning of this war, as a war-time election, to my regret, has become inevitable, we should endeavour to secure a fair expression of the people's will. We have some 300,000 men as members of the Canadian Expeditionary Force who cannot take in this election the same interest as they otherwise would. We have from 25,000 to 30,000 men dead in Europe, and I do not know how many lying ill in the hospitals there or prisoners in Germany. I am not prepared to admit that under these circumstances the members of a State whose laws of naturalization admit that they may take the oath of allegiance that entitles them to become British citizens and at the same time retain their home nationality, should at a time like this, be entrusted with the franchise. If I understand at all the principle of naturalization, it is that, that when a man swears allegiance to the Crown of Great Britain, it means that he has cut himself off from his former state and that Great Britain has a right to expect his service and his sacrifice and his support. And I say that when another nation says: you may take that oath; you may deceive the state in which you are settling; you may conceal the facts from that nation and we will if you ask us still give you protection and regard you as a German citizen—its citizens are not entitled to the franchise in Canada. But the law does not stop there; some might argue that this is a little thing and does not amount to very much because very few would take advantage of it. But let us refer again to 1913 law and see how much further it went. The general principle of naturalization is that once a man has lost his nationality in one country he cannot re-acquire it unless he again settles in the country. Let me refer to section 13 of the same law:

A former German who has not settled in Germany—

Note, he has left Germany, has become naturalized in another country and has not returned to Germany.

A former German, who has not settled in Germany, may be naturalized on his application by the Federal state to which he formerly belonged if he fulfils the requirements of section 8, paragraph 1, numbers 1 and 2; the child or adopted child of a former German has the same legal position. The Imperial Chancellor is to be informed before naturalization; naturalization does not take place if the Imperial Chancellor raises objections.

The provisions of paragraph 8, to which reference is made, are:

A foreigner who has settled in Germany may be naturalized, on his application, by the Federal State in whose territory such settlement has taken place—

(1) If, according to the laws of his previous home state, he is absolutely capable of transacting business, or would be absolutely capable of transacting business in the eye of German law, or if the application is made in accordance with section 7, paragraph 2, section 2, by his legal guardian or with his assent.

(2) If he has led an irreproachable life.

What does that mean? It means that anybody who came to Canada from the very beginning of the colonization that took place in this country until to-day, could become a German citizen again if he cared to make application to Germany, although his residence was still in Canada, by demonstrating to those at home that he had a capacity to carry on business and that his character was good. It means that the entire German population of the Northwest, if they so desired, might lead us to believe that they were no longer Germans, having become naturalized in Canada prior to 1915 and that, having made application to the German authorities at home they might become German citizens and entitled to all privileges of that nationality. Are these men to be entitled to vote, men whom we have thought to be British citizens but whose native country permits them at the same time to be German citizens? Are they to be entitled to the franchise at a trying time in the history of Canada and to be let cast a ballot when their brothers may be fighting against our men in Flanders, when their sentiment may be in favour of the early conclusioin of the war, while the national sentiment of this country may be to carry it to a definite conclusion? That does not seem reasonable.

Mr. McKENZIE: To what class of citizens is the hon. member referring, the Germans in Ontario or in the West?

Mr. NICKLE: I am speaking on the general principles of nationality as applied to the Germans throughout the world. Apply it specifically or generally as you will.

Mr. GRAHAM: Is not the hon. gentleman's argument at variance with the promise of the Prime Minister to the hon. member for North Waterloo (Mr. Weichel) a few moments ago with regard to the naturalization of men in Ontario?

Mr. NICKLE: No. The policy of the Prime Minister, as I understood it, was that these people who had been in Canada for

twenty-five years or thereabouts would be granted naturalization if they desired it.

Mr. MACDONALD: They would be German subjects.

Mr. NICKLE: No, they would not. The principles of the law are these: Since 1914 by the principles of the Delbrück law, any German who desires to be naturalized throughout the world for business or commercial or professional reasons, as a citizen of a non-German country has a right to become naturalized, and if he has had the consent of the German authorities, as set out in paragraph 25, to become naturalized, he is still entitled to retain and does retain his German citizenship, and the German Empire recognizes the dual nationality. That is my first proposition. My second is this, that if, prior to that date, any German had become naturalized anywhere in the world, he has a right, under paragraph 13, to become again a German citizen. For the sake of my argument, assuming he had lost his German citizenship under the law of 1870, he can again become a German citizen by making application to the Federal State or to the Imperial authorities by showing that he has business capacity and has led an irreproachable life. In other words, my argument is that the law of 1913 recognized a dual and fluctuating nationality.

Mr. PUGSLEY: Does my hon. friend say that an Act passed in 1913 would apply to those who became naturalized British subjects ten, fifteen or twenty years before in Canada? Is it retroactive?

Mr. NICKLE: No, it is not retroactive, nor does it need to be. A law does not need to be retroactive which gives a right to a man to re-acquire his German nationality while in a foreign state it would apply to the future.

Mr. PUGSLEY: Where previous to naturalization in a foreign country he had got leave from the German Government. Therefore, it cannot be recognized.

Mr. NICKLE: My hon. friend opposite (Mr. Pugsley) is confusing the argument. Let me repeat the law, as I understand it. Paragraph 25 lays down the principle that if, prior to making application for naturalization subsequent to 1914, the German gets the consent of the German authorities provided for by the second paragraph of 25, he can retain his dual nationality, and he may become a British subject, and still be a German subject. He may become a citizen of the United States, and still be a German subject at the same time, and if, prior to that date, he acquires the nationality of any one of these countries, or of any other country, while he loses his nationality by doing this prior to the passing of the Delbrüch law, by section 13 provision is made for him again becoming a German citizen, although he continues to live in the foreign state in which he acquires nationality; in other words, it recognizes the dual nationality.

Mr. PUGSLEY: Would not my hon. friend's remark as to the right to become re-naturalized in Germany apply to the very worthy gentleman from Ontario whom the Prime Minister has indicated would be naturalized?

Mr. NICKLE: It certainly would, but in the case of the man who has lived in the country for twenty-five or fifty years, and helped to build it up, I am prepared to take chances, but I do not want to take any chances with the men who have come to the country within the last five, ten or fifteen years, and who have not become imbued with our ideas of civilization. I am prepared to take chances with the man who has been here for twenty-five years, who has cut himself off from the home land, and who occupies a position, as my right hon. friend says, that the French Canadian occupies, namely, they have cut themselves off from overseas relatives, and are Canadians in sentiment and ideals. However, a totally different condition prevails with reference to the condition of the men who have left Germany within the last ten or fifteen years, and who, perhaps, have brothers and sisters over there who are still members of the German Empire, and are interested in the success of the German arms and the cessation of hostilities.

I am in favour of the Bill for another reason. I believe the mothers, sisters, daughters and the wives of our soldiers are entitled to the vote. I think they are entitled to it because some 300,000 of our men are out of Canada, over at the front, and cannot, therefore, exercise in this election the influence they would ordinarily have; and owing to the fact that some 30,000 are dead, and others lying in the hospitals. I was surprised the other night to listen to the speech of the hon. gentleman from Shefford (Mr. Boivin), who seemed to treat with scorn the sacrifices which the relatives of the soldiers had made in this war. He said they stayed at home and drew separation allowances and from the Patriotic Fund. He must have come from a district where men

have not gone overseas in large numbers. I come from a section of country whence the very best of our blood has gone to the front. I have seen women hold their children to their breast and smile as they said good-bye to the men who were entraining to go overseas. I have seen them hold their children close to them as the train pulled from the station, as they turned away with a sob in their throats. I have been in contact with these people month in and month out, year in and year out, since the war commenced, and I have seen sacrifices made by them which made my heart bleed. Yet, we are told these women made no sacrifices, and that their financial condition is better than it was before the war. Perhaps the financial condition of some of them is better than before the war, but surely the people who have made tremendous sacrifices are entitled to a great deal of consideration. Surely these women who have borne the shock of the telegram handed to them telling them of a brother or a husband being taken away, are entitled to consideration. If I know the sentiments of the women of this country it is this: that, although they may want the vote, and many worthy women may be disappointed at not getting it, I do believe there are but few reasonable women from one end of Canada to the other who will not be prepared to say that the women who have sacrificed so much by giving their male relatives to this war have a right to say what Government shall take charge of the destinies of the country for the next few years, whether a government which is determined to see this war carried on until it is brought to a victorious conclusion shall be placed in power, or whether we are to have a government in power which is opposed to selective conscription, and which will only endeavour to secure reinforcements by voluntary methods. Those who have been connected with the history of the effort know that it is futile now to attempt to get further men in that way. Are the men who have died and given their lives in Flanders, to have made that sacrifice in vain? Are those of us who have said good-bye to friends we will never see again to say that the sacrifice these men have made amounts to naught? J. McDonald Mowat, the man who opposed me in the last election was a brave man. No braver man could be found. He went to the front and his dust enriches Flanders. He gave his life to the nation, and am I to stand by and see this sacrifice made in vain? I cannot bring myself to it. I voted for conscription because I believe the men at the front are entitled to reinforcements from Canada, and I will vote for this Bill for the same reason. I desire to see this war carried to a successful conclusion, and I believe the true Canadians are in sympathy with my ideas, in sympathy with the cause of the British Empire, and in sympathy with those who have said to the men now at the front, "If you volunteer and go, we on our part, will see that no stone is left unturned to see that the last man and the last dollar that Canada can spare is used to secure you necessary reinforcements." I vote for this Bill, so that those whose sympathies are with the British Empire and with democracy, may have the decision as to what Government shall be in power after the next election takes place.

Mr. D. D. McKENZIE (North Cape Breton): I am sure that any observations which are made by hon. gentlemen supporting the Government to the effect that the people of this country are anxious to win the war, and anxious to do anything and everything necessary for the support and comfort of the soldiers at the front is not controverted by members on this side of the House, or by anyone else in this country, as far as I know. I am surprised that a member of the experience and intellectual talents of the hon. member for Kingston (Mr. Nickle) should find it necessary to stand up in this House and make an argument that he is supporting this Bill because, in some far-fetched and indirect way, he thinks it is going to help the soldier at the front. I am sure there is only one mind, heart and thought in this country so far as that subject is concerned, and I trust the hon. member for Kingston will, for all time, dismiss from his mind the idea that there is any other thought on this side of the House, or in the Liberal party of this country. I am sure he has not found any man on this side of the House voting against any proposition, financial or otherwise, that was calculated to advance the cause of the Allies in this great struggle.

I cannot agree, Sir, with the philosophy of the member for Kingston concerning Germans in Canada, either those in the far West or those in Ontario. It seems that under Tory rule, and according to Tory doctrine and Tory belief, the thraldom of far-away countries is still binding upon subjects of those countries who come to settle in Canada. Before Tory rule was commenced, it was a generally accepted principle that the moment such men set foot

upon British soil, they became free. According to the member for Kingston, that is no longer the law; that is no longer the principle that is to govern Canadian and British institutions. According to him, a man who comes into this country and takes the oath of allegiance to the Sovereign, thereby being invested with all the rights belonging to a British subject, must be treated as an alien, as a traitor, as another Dr. Jekyll and Mr. Hyde, one moment a German and the next a Britisher. If I know anything about the manhood of this country and about our constitution, there is—to recall the story told by the member for Edmonton (Mr. Oliver)—"no such animal" in this country.

I cannot reconcile the doctrine laid down by the member for Kingston with the promises made by his leader. When the member for North Waterloo goes home, he will carry on one side of his horse the promise made by the Prime Minister and on the other the speech of the member for Kingston. It is unfortunate that he should have to do that, because the speech and the promise are absolutely irreconcilable; they are unmixable; they conflict with each other. When the member for North Waterloo gets home, he will have not even a grease spot of a promise to present to his people. But I suppose the member for North Waterloo understands the game. He understands that promises are made, but that they are not necessarily carried out if the party making them is returned to power. He understands that the Prime Minister is not to be taken seriously. The Prime Minister on various occasions promised the country that there would be no conscription; yet he betook himself to compulsory military service. He promised 2,000,000 women in Canada that they would have the franchise. This promise he tears up as a scrap of paper and these 2,000,000 women confront the Prime Minister and ask him to implement his promise. If these 2,000,000 women bring actions for breach of promise against the Prime Minister in the courts of this country he will have a busy time during the election. His time will be well occupied defending himself against this army of indignant women who insist upon the fulfilment of the promise that he made and so ruthlessly broke. I am sure, therefore, that the member for North Waterloo will understand that he has nothing to expect as a result of the promises made by the Prime Minister and by the Secretary of State. It was arranged that the promise should be made by these gentlemen, and that the logical, clear-cut speaker from Kingston should stand up and say that such a thing could not be done; that no remedy could be afforded to these people. That is for consumption in one part of Ontario; the promises of the Prime Minister and the Secretary of State are for consumption in another part of the province. We on this side of the House understand how the machine works; we understand how hon. gentlemen opposite swallow all that is said by members of the Government. Recently we had an example in the other Chamber of the extent of the reason and the logic that governs the actions of the Government majority. The leader of the Government in the Senate was asked by the Liberals the other night to accept amendments to an Act passed by this House involving the expenditure of millions of dollars of the people's money. He made this concise, crisp reply: "The only amendments that you will get, gentlemen, will be thirty-seven, forty-three." That, of course, meant the count that would be taken on the vote—and we get the same thirty-seven, forty-three in this House. We cannot expect anything but machine politics from hon. gentlemen opposite. In that machine the member for North Waterloo is a cog; he goes round with it, and I never saw him do his part better than he did this evening. I have no doubt that the member for North Waterloo was telling the truth when he said that he represented an intelligent people. But I do not think he was doing them justice when he blamed hon. gentlemen on this side for the condition of things that this Act is creating. What has Liberalism to do with the bringing forward of this Act? He tells us that the people of his county are true and loyal to British institutions. No Liberal in this House has ever said anything to the contrary. The member for South Wellington (Mr. Guthrie), since he struck the trail for the Tory Damascus across the way, has seen a good deal of light. He tells us that the people of North Waterloo are not loyal. We are not responsible for anything that he says in that regard. So far as this Bill is concerned he is not speaking for us. But, as hon. gentlemen opposite are taking the member for South Wellington to their hearts, let them settle with him the question whether or not he is giving proper testimony with regard to these men. If he is, these people have no right to apply for enfranchisement or for the rights of citizenship. We on this side are open-minded on this question. We have not asked for the disfranchisement of anybody. We are willing

to put ourselves in the hands of the people who live in this country and who have enjoyed our institutions. We are not afraid to compare our institutions with those of any other country in the world. We believe that the men and women who come into Canada and enjoy the rights and privileges and educational advantages of this country for fifteen or twenty years—aye, for three years, the period set out in our Naturalization Act—are so seized with the benefits of our institutions and the superiority of our laws, that they will be loyal, true and faithful to Canada. We believe that they are not willing to exchange the conditions under which they previously lived for those which they now enjoy in this country, no matter what country they came from.

That is the principle of Liberalism; that is the principle which we are willing to follow, and if there are any heartaches in this country because men and women are being disfranchised, the parties who have introduced this Bill, and other Bills almost as drastic, must take full responsibility; it is unworthy of the hon. member for North Waterloo to state that the trouble created by this Bill is attributable to us.

My hon. friend from Assiniboia (Mr. Turriff) has given us a piece of logic which I cannot very well digest. He says that the foreigners in the West and in Ontario and other parts of this country would be excellent and loyal citizens under a union government, but they are disloyal under the present Administration.

Mr. TURRIFF: I did not say anything of the kind.

Mr. McKENZIE: The hon. member said that if a union government had been formed this Bill would be absolutely unnecessary. What am I to understand from that? I am sure my hon. friend, with his well-balanced mind, must see that when he tells us that under a union government this law would not be necessary it means nothing else but that the creation of a union government would make loyal those whom he to-day brands as disloyal. I cannot understand or accept any such logic. If they are loyal and true to-day to the institutions of this country, then, no matter what kind of a government we have, they will be loyal to-morrow, because they are still the same people. Therefore, I cannot understand the reason by which the hon. member for Assiniboia is bringing himself to support this measure, and support the Government that is behind it.

Mr. TURRIFF: I must ask my hon. friend not to put words in my mouth that I did not use. I did not say that any settlers in the West or any other place were disloyal. I am voting against this Bill. My hon. friend is altogether wrong. He is away off.

Mr. McKENZIE: I do not know whether I am wrong or away off, but I do know that my hon. friend is not on the track where he used to run. So I think it is he that is off, and being off in one thing, he may be off in the whole. My hon. friend is not quite at home in the new element with which he has surrounded himself, he is not quite comfortable upon the diet on which he feeds.

A good deal of what would be regarded as deception outside of the House has been practised upon us by hon. gentlemen opposite in explaining the origin of this Bill. We were told at every turn that this Bill followed the Australian Bill. There is one peculiar provision in our Act to the effect that if a man goes into a booth to vote with a grey coat on, and white shoe laces, the presiding officer can declare him to be an alien and not entitled to vote, whereas if the same alien appears in a black coat and with black shoe laces, his appearance would justify the presiding officer in saying that he is not an alien, but a British subject and entitled to vote. When we found fault with that absurdity we were told by the Secretary of State that the provision followed word for word the terms of the Australian Act. I refer any hon. member of this House to page 5 of the Australian Act, a copy of which I had in my hand to-day, but which the Secretary of State required for some purposes of his own, and I have not got it now. There is only one copy of the Act in the city of Ottawa, I believe. If you will turn to page 5 of the Act you will see that there is no such provision in the Australian Act at all. The presiding officer in Australia has nothing to do or say as to the appearance of the men who appear before him to vote. So that when the minister stated that he had followed the Australian Act in that respect, he was deceiving us. Another thing is that there is nothing in the Australian Act creating a new franchise or machinery for a new Act. The old Act is followed in every particular. If it is thought a man is not entitled to vote, he has to take the oath when he comes up to vote, as has been the case in this country at all times. I submit, therefore, that it was not fair for the

Secretary of State to take advantage of the fact that there was only one copy of the Australian Act in Ottawa. It was not right of him to say that he had a precedent in what was done in Australia, when such was not the case. I trust such practices will not be followed any more in this House, and that the minister will take an early opportunity of putting himself right. Perhaps he has been misled. When a minister makes a statement in Parliament there should not be the slightest doubt that he gives the facts, particularly when dealing with an Act of Parliament of another country.

I also wanted to deal briefly with the breach of faith on the part of the Government in this matter of votes for women. We were told that there was no time to bring about the changes that were necessary in order to give the vote to the women. The Government seems to blow hot and cold at the same time. In 1916 the Government was asked to provide Dominion-wide prohibition in Canada, and the Minister of Justice and the Prime Minister told us it would not be fair to pass a Dominion prohibitory law when the provinces themselves had not adopted prohibition, and they passed a law to aid any province which had passed a prohibitory law. If they were true to that principle they would now extend the franchise to the women of any province who have the right to vote at provincial elections. They were willing to follow the provinces on the question of temperance, when it was to their interest to do so; but now when it is a question of following the same principle, in taking advantage of the provincial franchise for women, that does not suit them at all. They do not want the women of this country to have a voice in the selection of the next Parliament. So they say: We will not follow the principle we adopted in 1916, but will disfranchise these women altogether. No matter what technical objection may be raised, I submit that our law clearly gives to women the right to vote in a Dominion election unless they are prevented by officers of this Government. There is no question but that the law gives the women of British Columbia, Alberta, Saskatchewan, Manitoba and Ontario the right to vote. Section 6 of the Election Act says:

> For the purposes of any Dominion election held within the limits of a province, the voters' lists shall, except as herein otherwise provided, be those prepared for the several polling divisions established, and which, on the sixtieth day next preceding the day fixed for the nomination of candidates for such Dominion election, were in force, or were last in force, under the laws of that province, for the purposes of provincial elections.

Section 10 of the same Act states the qualifications of voters, and I say emphatically that, on the face of it at all events, this covers the cases of women to which the local legislatures have given the vote. The section says:

> The qualifications necessary to entitle any person to vote at a Dominion election in any province shall, except as herein otherwise provided, be those established by the laws of that province as necessary to entitle such person to vote in the same part of the province at a provincial election.

Nothing can be clearer than that. These two sections give the women of the Dominion of Canada the right to vote, but for some reason or another—perhaps for the reason that they fear the judgment of these women—the Government refuses to give them the franchise. This Government is supposed to be a democratic government, which is supposed to represent a free people, which is supposed to have its life for the constitutional term of five years, and under that constitution it is compelled to go back to our free people to pass judgment upon it. It is not an act of bravery or a constitutional act for this Parliament, or this Government, to change the condition of things from that which existed when it received the mandate from the people. It should go back to the same free people that elected it. But it has changed the law, and has put itself in the position of the man who is on trial for a crime, and who arrogates to himself the right to make the law under which he is to be tried, to appoint the judge who is to pass judgment upon him, and to select the jury which is to try him. That is the kind of government we have to-day, a government which has thrown aside the constitutional right which the people of this country have been enjoying; and now that they are before the bar of public opinion, and when the trial is on and the indictment is about to be made, they take to themselves the power of naming the jury, naming the judge, and making the procedure under which they are to be tried. I submit that is not fair treatment for the people of this country, and I believe that the people will not tolerate any such doctrine or any such principle, but that that freedom which characterizes our people, that freedom of which we are so proud, will be maintained, and that any one who endeavours to contaminate, the streams of justice and freedom in this country will go

down with the stream and perish forever out of sight.

Mr. J. A. CURRIE (North Simcoe): I would not at this late hour and at this late date in the session presume to occupy any of the time of the House were it not that during the debate the other evening unfortunately some charges were made against me by the hon. member for North Cape Breton (Mr. McKenzie). Under the rules of the House it appeared impossible for me to make any explanation, however——

Mr. PROULX: I rise to a point of order. The hon. member is not keeping to the subject under discussion. The question before the House is the Franchise Bill.

The DEPUTY SPEAKER (Mr. Rainville): I will take note of the point of order raised. The hon. member for North Simcoe (Mr. Currie) has just said a few words, not sufficient for me to make up my mind.

Mr. CURRIE: The hon. gentleman should wait until I transgress the Rules of the House before he rises to a point of order. In this House we are supposed to have a certain amount of free speech. It is unnecessary for me to point out that according to the Rules of the House members of His Majesty's service are not supposed to have aspersions cast upon them. In the discussion of the Franchise, naturally hon. gentlemen get a little warmed up, and they say things to each other which, perhaps, may be a little aside from the question. During the course of the debate I addressed a remark to the hon. member for North Cape Breton. I asked him if he would permit me to put a question to him. Hon. members will remember that instead of extending to me the courtesy of allowing me to ask him an innocent question, or in any event a question pertaining to the measure before the House, he jumped up in a passion and said he would not be interrupted by me, and that I was the "chucker-out" of the Conservative party, or something to that effect. Of course, that is a term which is, to my mind, insulting, to a certain extent. However, that is altogether aside from the question. Naturally, when I got an opportunity the other evening, I returned in kind, and gave him a name. Now, unfortunately the Rules of the House do not permit of my explaining what a mud-gun is, or I would explain it. If I gave an explanation I would be immediately called to order. In reply, he cast some reflections upon my character as an officer of His Majesty's forces, to which the ex-Minister of Militia (Sir Sam Hughes) answered yesterday. If there is one thing that this electoral law has to do with, it is with this war. It is well known that the intention of this Act is to permit of our having a war-time election. An electoral law is always intended to return a Parliament for a definite purpose. Parliament has a perfect right under the Constitution to make its own electoral laws. The Constitution is society at rest; the electoral law, such as we have now before us, is society in action, the state in action, and for that reason this electoral law is intended to give the people of this country an opportunity of casting their votes and having their say, as to whether the men at the front are going to be supported or not.

10 p.m.

Mr. PUGSLEY: Some of the people.

Mr. CURRIE: That is the issue. Three or four weeks before the next election, there will be only that one issue before the people of this country. We must submerge all questions of economics for the moment. I confess that as a hide bound protectionist I have had to surrender all my tenets in the presence of the common danger, and many a Liberal has had to surrender his theories of free trade in presence of the common danger. For that reason, when an hon. member rises in his place in this House and casts reflections upon a member of the House who is debating this Bill, it comes within the purview of these rules. The hon. member for North Cape Breton stated that I was up to my neck in mud in a dugout whilst my men were fighting. There are thousands of soldiers in the dugouts in Flanders to-night. The dugouts in my day were not what they are now, concrete bombproof dugouts. The testimony of my men in regard to my conduct in the war is ample, so far as I am personally concerned. That testimony speaks for itself. I never was in a dugout during a battle, unless it was to carry a wounded man into some of the little shelters that were then termed dugouts. Many of the poor men that I carried into those dugouts during the battle were afterwards bayonetted by the Germans, to whose relatives my hon. friends opposite are so anxious to give the vote. They will never come forward to give testimony as to what I did on that occasion. I will meet them perhaps; I am assured that I will meet them, in the future; but in this world they can never give testimony

as to what I did for them. It was impossible for me to be with all my men but I was with a certain number of them in the front line. I never left the front line throughout one of the greatest battles in history. I remained all the time during the battle until I was ordered to retire. I have the "order" to retire the remnant of my battalion still in my possession and when we retired I was the last man to leave the trenches. I am only stating the facts. It is very difficult for a man to stand up and boast or blow about his own actions. These are not things that a man feels like boasting about to the public. It is not pleasant for me to think about them, and it was not necessary for me to go about the House blowing about the number of men I had slain. The scenes that I have witnessed are too terrible for me to speak of even to my best friends. As to this question of a dugout, there were no dugouts. They were all blown up in fifteen minutes after the action started, just as the British are blowing up the dugouts to-day. They were only frail structures of mud. Therefore, that charge falls to the ground. I remained with my men.

The Government have in their archives the reports of other officers with regard to myself. They have the reports of the officer of the 7th who took command when Hart McHarg was slain; He reported to me and his report is in the Militia department. I was on the furthermost line in the second battle of Ypres. I met the second in command of the 10th, who is now a brigadier-general, and he also reported to me. His men were being sent down to assist the remnant under me that was still holding out. At that time he had, out of a great battalion, something like 150 men left. He wrote in his report that he had reported to me, a moment later he was wounded and carried off the field. I was with my battalion then and that was only an hour or so from the time that we were ordered out. How could I have been away back four or five miles from the firing line?

The ex-Minister of Militia (Sir Sam Hughes) has done me justice on several occasions. I did not know that he had sent my name in for promotion There is one thing that I have not sought and that is promotion. Because of political consideration or because of being a member of this House I never asked the minister for a single favour in the way of promotion. When I was going to Valcartier I went in to bid my chief good-bye. He said "Col. Currie, you shall have a brigade". I said: "No, Mr. Borden, I would prefer to go with the men I am bringing with me and I want to go as a colonel". In those days promotions were not as much sought as they are to-day. We all thought that the best place to win our promotion was on the field. Never, since I have come home, have I importuned with the Minister of Militia for any promotion. When I left France I was fifth in seniority of the first division. I was asked to come home by the Government, I did not ask to come home. I was asked to come home by the Government to give some information and to assist in recruiting here. I came home. Little did I expect that when I came I would find so much excitement in the country and that I would have to meet the charge of having run away from my men. I never asked the minister to give me any promotion. I was in the West for a month after he returned and did not know anything about those beautiful lies they were passing around about me. The minister told me that he was going to promote me as I should have been promoted automatically. According to the customs and rules of the service, whilst I was in the King's service on active service and had done nothing wrong, I was entitled to be kept in my position under the Militia Act. Promotion comes according to seniority. When they were giving promotion to others in the service my promotion should have come automatically. But my promotion did not come automatically. Others were put over me in the Militia List and others given command over me at home who were never at the war. Naturally, I did not feel that I was dealt justly with in that regard. Still, I make no complaint. I did not earn any subsequent promotion in the field and I do not think I should say anything about it. I have covered the question of my promotion, of my conduct in the field and of my service.

I tried to serve in accordance with the best traditions of the British House of Commons. I thought that if I did anything wrong it would be a big reflection on this House. I went to the war in the first place so that it could not be said, in so far as the House of Commons was concerned, that it was a nest of slackers that never gave any service to the war in contradition to the fact that the British House of Commons has given over 150 members to the war. This House has given a number of members to the war but it has not looked to its ancient dignities and rights in the honours which it has conferred upon its members who have gone

overseas. Some of the members who have gone abroad and served have not been given the opportunities for service which might very well have been given to them. A member who goes to the war makes a great sacrifice. There are members of this House who have raised one or two regiments and sent them over to the war and gone over with them. One hundred years ago, if a man raised a regiment for the King's service, he would have been made a baronet or a knight for that deed.

Mr. PUGSLEY: They make them knights and barons for much less than that now.

Mr. CURRIE: They have to be munition makers or something else. It is not a soldier member who gets rank and title now. Many members of this House who went over in good faith have been recalled without being given an opportunity for service. I regret very much that such should be the case, and I do not think that they were given the opportunity to which they were entitled. However, the opportunity of service came to me, and I served for weeks and months in the trenches, day in and day out, when there was constant action and death constantly calling. There never was a day that somebody was not wounded or killed. During that whole period there never was a court of inquiry on me or any complaint against me in any manner, shape or form. There was no court-martial asked for or ordered. Unlike some hon. gentlemen opposite, who have been preaching politics a good deal lately, I did not undergo any court of inquiry and I did not need to be whitewashed by a court-martial to keep me from being cashiered out of the service.

Hon. gentlemen opposite have opposed, not only this measure, but virtually everything in connection with the war since the beginning of this session. We have had constant obstruction, of course, of a constitutional kind, and when we glance over the gentlemen on the other side of the House who have been most prominent in this obstruction, we find the hon. member for St. John (Mr. Pugsley), the hon. member for North Cape Breton (Mr. McKenzie), and the hon. member for Guysborough (Mr. Sinclair). The hon. member for North Cape Breton said I had remained quiet for a long time in the House.

I remained quietly for a long time in the House because I did not wish to interrupt or to lengthen the session. I knew the need of reinforcements, the importance of carrying this war on, and I did not wish to prolong the debate. But if you ask yourself what have these three gentlemen done for the war; the mothers, the sisters, the women of Nova Scotia who sent their sons and brothers to the war, the women of New Brunswick—let them ask themselves if those three men have done their duty so far as their children are concerned, and ask the reason. The hon. member for St. John (Mr. Pugsley) has a son. Has he been at the war distinguishing himself? Is he sleeping in a dug-out up to his neck in mud at night? Nothing of the kind. The hon. member for North Cape Breton (Mr. McKenzie) should be the last man in this House to say a word about the war. His son has been tucked away out of sight during the war. Months ago he should have been at the war along with the other brave Highlanders from Cape Breton. The Highlanders are supposed to be a brave race, and I must say the majority of them are; but there are occasional degenerates amongst them. The exceptions only prove the rule.

Mr. McKENZIE: I do not think the hon. member has any business to refer to my son. He is in khaki receiving his training, getting ready to go to the front as speedily as he can.

Mr. CURRIE: I thought the hon. gentleman would make that statement. He was old enough to have gone with the First Division. He takes on his khaki and uniform as an officer now when this conscription Bill is introduced in this House. He does not want to take his chance going over as an ordinary conscript. The hon. member for Guysborough (Mr. Sinclair) remains silent and his case is on a similar level.

Mr. SINCLAIR: If the hon. member will allow me I will answer him.

Mr. CURRIE: I want an explanation from you as a Scotchman.

Mr. SINCLAIR: The attack the hon. gentleman is making shows the kind of soldier he is, and shows the colour of his liver.

Mr. CURRIE: Make your explanation.

Mr. SINCLAIR: I will not say it is white, because that would not be parliamentary; but I will say this to the hon. gentleman, that it is a mean and cowardly thing——

Some hon. MEMBERS: Order.

Mr. SINCLAIR: —for any gentleman to attack a young Canadian who is not present here to defend himself.

Mr. CURRIE: Mr. Speaker, I think that interruption was altogether uncalled for.

Mr. SINCLAIR: He has mentioned my son and I should be given a chance to answer.

Mr. DEPUTY SPEAKER: Order.

Mr. SINCLAIR: I am not going to break the rules, I am going to make a short explanation.

Mr. PUGSLEY: The Speaker ruled that in order the other night.

Mr. CURRIE: I want the hon. gentleman to explain why his son is not in khaki, that is what I want.

Mr. SINCLAIR: I will explain it if my hon. friend will give the opportunity.

Mr. DEPUTY SPEAKER: I hope the hon. gentleman will use language in accordance with the dignity of the House of Commons.

Mr. SINCLAIR: My son was one of the first to enlist in the town in which he lives, at the time the war broke out. He offered himself for service and he was turned down by the medical authorities at that time as not being fit for service. He was anxious to do something and still persisted in his offer and they accepted him and sent him with a company of the 85th Highlanders to Canso to do service in connection with guarding the cable stations there. He remained there about fifteen months carrying out such instructions as were given to him by the military authorities, and at the end of that time his company was dismissed or sent back and another company was put in place of the Pictou company to do service at Canso. Consequently he returned home. The National Service was started about the same time. He received a card from the National Service and filled it up offering to do anything that it was in his power to do, was quite willing to perform any duty that the Militia Department might assign to him I am sorry to say that his health has not been good of late and that he has recently come out of the hospital after a serious operation. That is the story so far as my son is concerned, and I think the hon. gentleman who has been boasting of his courage cannot say that it is a courageous thing for him, to attack in this House a respectable young Canadian who is not here to defend himself.

Mr. CURRIE: I trust Mr. Speaker, you will observe that there is about eight minutes of my time being taken up with interruptions. All I have to say to these three members is that they have sat here all session sneering at returned officers and soldiers on this side, attacking this Bill, the Military Service Bill, and the Soldiers Voting Bill, and when you come to listen to their excuses for their sons, what do they amount to? They are the fathers of "home guardsmen," that is all they are.

Mr. OLIVER: I want to say that what the hon. member says is contemptible.

Mr. CURRIE: Not more contemptible than the charge that the hon. gentleman made against the hon. leader of the House earlier in the session.

Mr. OLIVER: That has nothing to do with to-night's performance.

Mr. CURRIE: The hon. member for Edmonton (Mr. Oliver) sent to the front a boy who gave up his life and who was not in the home guard; he gave up his life in Flanders. The hon. member favoured compulsory service surely in several speeches which he made in this House, but when a Bill was introduced for that service he turned his back upon it and became a politician, much to the astonishment of his friends and best neighbours.

I have a word to say about the leader of the Opposition (Sir Wilfrid Laurier). We know that there has been plenty of interruption in this House and plenty of obstruction. Every effort has been made to prolong this session so that the session would end automatically with the death of Parliament without anything having been done so far as conscription is concerned. The leader of the Opposition did not take very much part in the obstruction himself, but he gave the lead to his party, and that is that he is opposed to conscription. The boys at the front well know that. The men at the front know the need for reserves to make up for casualties and sufficient to enable some of those who have been at the front from the beginning to come home on a few weeks furlough, which none of them have been able to do. The right hon. leader of the Opposition has not only burked everything in this House, but he has sat in his seat for four weeks when his followers in Montreal were using dynamite and threatening daggers to public men in this country, but never once did he get up and denounce these men and say they had nothing to do with the Liberal party and were not his followers. But the public must have surmised, and come to the conclusion, that the official Liberal party has several ends to it, that it not only has a constitutional

party or a constitutional end, but that it has a force party,—a party that endeavours to intimidate people in this country, to threaten the lives of members of the Government, with dynamite and daggers. I ask him, how can any soldier at the front vote for a party of that kind?

Mr. OLIVER: Mr. Speaker,—

Mr. CURRIE: How can anybody in this country vote for a party tied up to an outfit such as that in Montreal?

Mr. OLIVER: Is the honourable gentleman aware that two of the dynamiters arrested are ticket-of-leave men let out by the Minister of Justice a short time before they coommited the crime—possibly for the purpose of committing the crime?

Mr. CURRIE: You will observe, Mr. Speaker, that I have about two minutes.

Mr SPEAKER: The deputy Speaker, who has been in the Chair, informs me that the hon. member has two minutes.

Mr. CURRIE: I will occupy my two minutes in stating that I think it is time, —after four weeks in this House— that the right hon. leader of the Opposition (Sir Wilfrid Laurier) spoke. He stood with me on a platform in Ottawa after I returned, and I was very proud of him when he spoke in favour of the war as he did, asking the people to support our boys at the front. Why did he not keep up that record? I say when he now sits for four weeks in this House, when men are cheering for him in Montreal and threatening to use dynamite against innocent people, why has he not rebuked them? It is too late now, after the Bill is through, for him to come through and say he had nothing to do with it.

I have read a resolution passed up in Lambton at a convention, the other day in which they said they wanted the Liberal candidates to win the war as Laurier wanted them to and they said: They were all for conscription the same as Laurier was. Sir, the speakers outside this House supporting the right hon. leader of the Opposition are those who have spoken for him with dynamite in Montreal. Not one single argument has been advanced by him or his speakers on the public platform in my province or in any English-speaking province to show that his heart was in the war or that he wanted to support the men at the front.

Sir WILFRID LAURIER: Mr. Speaker, it was not my good fortune or bad fortune to hear the whole of the speech of my hon. friend from Simcoe (Mr. Currie). I came in when he was referring to a young man, the son of an old friend whom I have known personally from boyhood up to the present time. If my words would mean anything, there never was a more unseemly and unwarranted attack upon a young man than the attack of the hon. gentleman upon the son of the hon. member for Guysborough (Mr. Sinclair). This young man was one of the first to enlist, was eager to do so, and is not in the force to-day because his health would not permit of it. He had to go to the hospital to undergo a serious operation which disables him for the service. That ought to be sufficient for the hon. gentleman. If he has any manhood in him he will not rest where he has left the matter, but will apologize to the young man, who is just as worthy as himself to wear the King's uniform—and if he does not wear that uniform it is through no fault of his, but because he cannot do so; otherwise he would be in the trenches to-day. As to myself, my record is before the House. It has been before the House since the commencement of the war. Everybody knows it; I have been in favour of the war. I have been and am against conscription. As to the attack made upon me by the hon. gentleman that the men to-day who are using dynamite in Montreal are my friends, all that I have to say to him is, that the men who are using dynamite in Montreal belong to the criminal classes. There is only one of them to-day who is not of that class and that is Mr. Lalumiere, the man who took part in the election when Mr. Coderre, now Judge Coderre, went before the electors after the resignation of the late Mr. Monk. When the hon. member says men are cheering for me in Montreal, there are some who have done so, but does the hon. gentleman not know that some others at the same meeting cried, "Down with Laurier"? If the hon. gentleman does not know that, he does not read the papers. It is a matter of public record, and everybody knows it except my hon. friend. I think I have been too long in public life to defend myself from these attacks. I have been endeavouring all my life to fight a square and honest battle. The charge made against me on the floor of this House, where I have sat for more than forty years, is shown by what I have said to have not a shadow of foundation. I do not want to meet such people as he has referred to. I do not belong to the class of men who have come from the penitentiary. I have nothing to do with them, and I do not know any of

them. All I have to say is that I shall continue in the future as in the past, to try to perform my duty as a British subject and a Canadian to the best of my judgment and ability. It cannot be expected that in a free country like Canada we should all see alike upon these matters. No man's heart is deeper in the war than my own. But because I do not agree with other men upon the policy of conscription, gentlemen say my heart is not in the right place. That is a matter of judgment. Whether I am right or wrong to-day, my conduct and position is before the Canadian people, and I am quite willing to leave it there.

But, Sir, I did not rise at all for the purpose of defending myself. Those who have been in the House for the last six years, and those who have been here before that, know that on no occasion did I ever take notice of any personal attack made upon me. I rose to discuss the question now before the House, and in the few minutes I have at my command it is impossible to survey the whole situation, and I shall confine myself to the question now before the House. The indictment which we make against the policy of the Government, and against this Bill, is that it is a breach of faith. Our position, which I lay before the gentlemen on the other side of the House as well as upon this side is this: The exclusion which it is sought to make of men who for the last fifteen years we have recognized as fellow-countrymen is an absolute and unwarranted breach of faith. This accusation has been resented by members of the Government and by their followers, and by none more vigorously than the hon. member for Calgary (Mr. Bennett). It was not my privilege to hear the speech of the hon. member for Calgary the other day, but I read it with great care and attention. I thought it was a very high-class address, but it seemed to me to be based upon an absolutely fallacious foundation. He said very truly that citizenship and franchise are not convertible terms, that a man may be a citizen and yet not be an elector. To this no exception can be taken. All this had already been enunciated by the Secretary of State (Mr. Meighen) who in the course of the debate stated that no pledge had been given to any class of citizen for the franchise except, possibly, to the Mennonites and Doukhobors. Indeed that is perfectly true. The Doukhobors and Mennonites were especially given an exemption from military service, and all that it implies, and all this was done by Order in Council cited in this Bill, on the 13th August, 1873, by the Government of Sir John Macdonald, as far as the Mennonites are concerned, and on the 6th December, 1898, by the late government, as far as the Doukhobors were concerned. These two classes of His Majesty's subjects, the Mennonites and Doukhobors, are exempted from military service. They have enjoyed the privilege of exemption ever since they came into this country. Now they have to purchase their release from military service by forsaking their franchise. If they keep their franchise they lose everything that they have been given by these two Orders in Council. It is true that the same privileges are not given to the other aliens, who are enfranchised, but what does it matter to-day? Even if such a solemn declaration of exemption as has been given to the Mennonites and Doukhobors, were given to these aliens, they would not be any more advanced, because the solemn promise made to the Doukhobors and Mennonites is to-day treated as a scrap of paper—in fact, it is not worth the paper on which it was written; it is of the same value as the signature of the King of Prussia on the treaty which guaranteed the independence of Belgium. It was observed so long as it suited the purposes of the King of Prussia, now the Emperor of Germany, but when he found that treaty in his way, he simply set it aside, as we are doing with the solemn promises which we gave to the Doukhobors and Mennonites.

But, Sir, it is not on this ground that I rest the assertion that I have made that we are breaking faith with those we brought into this country when we pass this Bill. What I submit to the hon. member for Calgary is this: when we invited these men, and sent out agents to Germany and Austria to bring them to Canada, when we gave them naturalization, there was an implied pledge that never, under any circumstances would their origin be a reproach to them, that they would never be debarred from all privileges of British citizenship, and there would be no abridgement of any privileges given to them.

Does my hon. friend dispute that position? Does he think it is right that, having by naturalization given these people the privilege of citizenship, we should, by telling them that they can be citizens, but not electors, set aside one of those privileges? Why can they not be electors? It is admitted by the Prime Minister and by everybody who has spoken in this debate that those who have been naturalized since

April, 1902, no matter what country they came from, have behaved splendidly and have fulfilled everything expected of them. The only reason these men are disfranchised now is because they are distrusted, because it is believed that they cannot be trusted with the privilege of casting their votes according to their conscience. The member for Calgary knows as well as anybody that under British institutions every man has always had the right to say what he wants to say and to do what he wants to do, provided he is within the law. This privilege, however, is now to be denied to certain persons. What reason is given for this course? My hon. friend went further, and tried to justify the action of the Government by saying that these men should not be trusted, because, according to some authority, the name of which he did not give, blood is the most potent incentive of the actions of men. I am not sure that I agree with his philosophy. Blood is certainly a powerful tie; we all admit that. But there is a tie still more powerful, and that is the tie of home; the associations connected with home are more potent than ties of blood. When a man leaves his country to settle elsewhere, though the land of his ancestors may be dear to him, the land of his children is still dearer. When a man leaves a country he does so because he is not satisfied with the conditions that he leaves behind him; if he were satisfied he would remain in the land of his ancestors. He leaves, he comes to Canada; he is welcomed; he comes upon invitation; he is given all the privileges enjoyed by other citizens; he is entitled to become an owner of property and to have the franchise. Suddenly we tell him: We cannot trust you any more. It is quite true that "citizenship" and "franchise" are not synonymous terms. But it is true, also, that citizenship is the basis of franchise. My hon. friend pointed out that Nova Scotia and Quebec had adopted laws effecting an abridgement of the franchise in respect of some classes of His Majesty's subjects—for instance, person employed by the Federal Government. That is true, but I am not aware that this law of exclusion has worked to the advantage of anybody. I am not aware that the Government which introduced or the legislature which adopted such a law ever derived any benefit from it; on the contrary, I believe that all such legislation of a restrictive character has rather proved a boomerang than helped the Government which introduced it.

But my hon. friend brought forth an argument which was really of some consequence. Discussing the status of these German citizens of Canada, he asserted that they were still Germans and that, therefore, they should be deprived of the franchise. In connection with this point he made an argument, which I could not exactly follow, with regard to the amendment to the naturalization law which is to come into force on January 1, next, under the Act passed in 1914. Our naturalization law as it now stands is effective only within Canadian territory. If a man of foreign birth becomes naturalized in Canada and goes to another country, he is no longer a Canadian citizen or a British subject. No matter what country he goes to—United States, England, a foreign country—he is not a British subject; he is a foreigner. The effect of our law after the 1st of January, 1918, will be that a man who is naturalized in Canada will be a citizen of Canada and a British subject no matter what part of the British Empire he goes to. I hope that similar legislation will be introduced in other Dominions, providing that wherever a naturalized British subject shall go he shall continue to be a British subject.

The member for Kingston laid down a new doctrine, to which I am unable to agree; that under the law of Germany a man could have a double nationality—he could be a British subject in Canada and a German subject in Germany. My impression all along has been that the German law claimed jurisdiction over the German subject, no matter where that German subject was naturalized. My hon. friend says that there is an international law on this point.

Mr. NICKLE: By the law of 1870, if a German had been continuously out of Germany for ten years he lost his nationality. The law of 1913 changed that.

Sir WILFRID LAURIER: I shall not dispute that point with my hon. friend. My impression has been that the German law always claimed jurisdiction over the German subject, even when he was naturalized elsewhere. There is no international law on this point, so far as I know. Every nation has its own law in respect of naturalization. Great Britain foregoes her claim upon anybody who goes abroad and becomes naturalized in another country. Other nations do the same, but some nations, including Germany, do not follow that plan. Under the German law, once a German a man is always a German; at

all events that is the law to-day. I do not speak of my own knowledge in this matter; I simply speak of my impression of it. But I notice that the member for Calgary the other day said that if a citizen of Germany is naturalized in Canada, he remains a citizen of Germany and would be liable to be shot if taken prisoner in the theatre of war. This is what he said:

> Ceasing to be Britons, if they were taken prisoners in the front line trenches, they would be shot as traitors, because they owed military allegiance to Germany and Austria.

I think that the member for Calgary is right in that respect. If we sent a man of German origin to the front, he would, if taken prisoner, be treated as a deserter and accordingly might be liable to be shot. Our own Naturalization Act has been cautious on this point. The certificate of Naturalization says:

> This is therefore to certify to all whom it may concern, that under and by virtue of the said Act ..... has become naturalized as a British subject, and is, within Canada, entitled to all political and other rights, powers and privileges, and subject to all obligations to which a natural-born British subject is entitled or subject within Canada, with this qualification, that he shall not, when within the limits of the foreign state of which he was a subject (or citizen) previous to the date hereof, be deemed to be a British subject unless he has ceased to be a subject (or citizen) of that state, in pursuance of the laws thereof, or in pursuance of a treaty or convention to that effect.

In other words, we do not pretend in our Naturalization Act to claim jurisdiction over a subject when he goes to his own country. We cannot do that unless his native country divests itself of jurisdiction over him, or unless there was a treaty between the two countries, and so far as I know there is no treaty between Great Britain and Germany. So I think the position which was taken the other evening by my hon. friend from Calgary is perfectly sound. If we were to send a man of German origin to the trenches, and if he happened to be taken prisoner, he might be treated as a deserter by Germany. What is the conclusion we are to draw from this? The Military Service Act which we passed the other day makes no reservations on this point. Section 2 says:

> Every male British subject who comes within one of the classes described in section 3 of this Act (that is, between the ages of twenty and forty-five) shall be liable to be called out as hereinafter provided on active service in the Canadian Expeditionary Force for the defence of Canada, either in or beyond Canada.

This means that every man of military age, whether he is a British subject by birth or naturalization, is liable to be conscripted. Take the case of a boy six years of age, who happened to come to this country with his father in April, 1902. He would now be twenty-one and a voter, and liable to be conscripted. I agree with my honourable friend from Calgary that it would be unthinkable, it would be murderous, if we were to send such a man to the front when there was a possibility of him being treated as a deserter by our enemies if he were taken prisoner. The measure before the House takes care of that in the following provision:

> All persons who are by the terms of paragraphs (g) and (h) of section 67 of this Act disqualified from voting, with such of their sons as on polling day are not of legal age shall be, and shall be held, exempt from combatant military and naval service.

In other words, a man who is liable to be conscripted can purchase his release by renouncing his privileges as a citizen and as a voter. That, I think, is a proper interpretation of the Act. My hon. friend from Calgary argued that a man of the class I have just described could be conscripted unless he renounced his privileges as a voter. I take a different view from my hon. friend both in his premises and in his conclusion. It seems to me that this man ought not to lose his privileges as a voter. He has left Germany and come to this country. He has become interested in this country, so much so that he desires the privileges of British citizenship. The Government which he has left still claims the right of life and death over him. It seems to me that this man ought to be treated as a British subject. His heart must be somewhere, and his heart would probably be where his home is. I would say this to my hon. friend from Calgary: there is far more to be gained by trusting people than by distrusting them. And if I object to this legislation, it is not so much for its present effect, as for the effect it will have in the future. We are striving to make Canada, young nation as we are, a great and powerful nation. We have long realized that to do that by ourselves would be a long and painful task. We have opened our door to the whole world, and have sent our agents everywhere. I have here a pamphlet in the German language urging Germans and Austrians to settle in Canada: we offer them everything we have. Many of these people have come to our country; they have settled here and behaved well, and we cannot break faith with them. The Germans have committed crimes in this war that have no

parallel in the last fifteen hundred years, but the blame is to be attached not so much to the German people as to the government of Germany. For my part I have not lost faith in the German people. I rather hope with President Wilson that the German people themselve will help to finish the war and deal with their own government. I have faith in the German people; I have faith in our fellow-subjects of German origin in this country. These men have been proud of their new allegiance up to the present time, but will they have any reason to be proud after this day? Will they have the same pride in their new country as they had before? Do you believe, Sir, that the legislation we are discussing to-night is going to tend to make them more happy and more British than they were before? Sir, we must take the human heart as it is. The treatment those men are now receiving from men who claim to be their fellow citizens will have very far-reaching effects. The Government may win a temporary triumph; this measure may help to win the election. But the Government's gain will be the country's loss. If this be the Government's conception of how to make Canada a great country, it is not our conception on this side of the House. Our conception is to trust to the human heart and appeal to its better sentiments. If we cannot win by that method we do not want to win on any other basis.

Right Hon. Sir GEORGE FOSTER (Minister of Trade and Commerce): Mr. Speaker, from the commencement of this debate I have not taken any active part in it but I have been a pretty diligent listener. I have a few general remarks with which I would like to trouble the House. I shall not follow closely the line of argument which has been taken by my right hon. friend (Sir Wilfrid Laurier) with the object of making a reply to him. I am quite willing to let the statements which have been made by the hon. member for Calgary (Mr. R. B. Bennett) and the hon. member for Kingston (Mr. Nickle) go against the statements which have been made by my right hon. friend. They can be digested, and members of the House can come to their own conclusion.

The general remarks I have to make are along this line. Should I be going too far if I make the statement that in approaching this question some of us make the great mistake of not taking the proper relativity of questions into account? What I mean by that is: too many of us, I am afraid, have been arguing this question upon normal lines, as if the condition of affairs in the world, and the condition of affairs in Canada particularly, were the same as they were twelve years ago, ten years ago, eight years ago, or four years ago; and we are stickling for what we call privileges and rights and the permanence of certain phases of our political constitution, just the same if there were no cannons roaring and no great war in the world. That, I think, is the fundamental weakness of much of the argument that comes from the other side. My hon. friend from Edmonton (Mr. Oliver) or some other hon. gentlemen on the other side have asked the question: what is this Bill for; what is the purpose of it?

Mr. OLIVER: I did not ask the question.

Sir GEORGE FOSTER: And they have made the answer: "It is to win 11 p.m. the election for the Tory party; that is what it is for, and it is for nothing else." I do not think that is a reasonable position to take. I might make the retort to them that as far as profession of opinion and purpose and policy is concerned, taking the leader of the Opposition and the leader of the Government, there is one efficient war party in this country, and there is one war party which is not efficient, and if this Franchise Bill enables the efficient war party to win the election, and win the position to carry on what they have been carrying on for the last three years; if it helps to win for the Government it helps to win for the country and for the Empire. I have been at the inception of this Franchise Bill; I have watched it in its first discussions; I have followed it through all its stages. I have been a member of the Council and the Government which has worked with this Bill, which has brought it to its stage of perfection, whatever that may be considered to be, and which has launched it before this House. Speaking for myself, I do not think I ever had the idea that it would be a particularly pleasant thing for the Government of the day to introduce a Bill which would have the effect of disfranchising citizens of this country, who formerly had the franchise. I have not been particularly impressed that it would be a thing which would add very much, taking this year, and next year, and future years, to the prospects of the Liberal-Conservative party as a party. I have not

viewed it along these lines, but I will tell the House along what lines I have viewed it. I have viewed it along the line, which I consider the proper line, of putting as much punch and power behind the war government of this country, whatever Government it may be, as it is possible to put. I think there is necessity for that.

If I may be allowed an expression of my own opinion, I am sorry that we have ever been forced to hold an election in Canada in the midst of the turmoil and the burdens of this war. Aside from all questions of constitutional right, and constitutional practice, to my mind there is a condition in the world and a condition in Canada which might have been better met in this country by all of us coming to the conclusion that we could do without for another year exercising the right of ballot and devote ourselves entirely and wholly to the prosecution of the war. I am sorry that we have had to go to the country and hold an election during this war period, but it is not my fault. It is not the fault of the leader of the Government, it is not the fault of the Liberal-Conservative party. That we have to go to an election is the fault of my right hon. friend who sits opposite (Sir Wilfrid Laurier), if it is the fault of anybody. He had it all within his own power, and if he had done as he did a year ago, his party would have followed him, and we would be without the turmoil of an election. But now that the election is imminent, and must come, it is a war election, and nothing else. We are not in this election into which we are now entering to determine the question of permanent suffrage for any class of people in this country. We are not voting upon and determining what shall be the tariff policy of this country. We are not determining by our votes what shall be the policy of the Administration in any civil line. Now when we make the first step, and as we make every other step until the day upon which the votes are to be cast and counted, we are more and more determining the war policy of this country, and only the war policy of this country. That is the way I look upon it.

Now, if it is to be a war election, this measure which is before us is a war franchise measure. We would not have had it if there were no war. We all admit and believe that. We have this War Franchise Bill because we have a war, and because this is an election which is to be particularly and preeminently fought out with reference to the policy which shall prevail in carrying on the war. Let us take a step further. If we are in the throes of a war election, and if that election is to decide the measures which shall be taken and the efficiency with which the war policy shall be carried out—and I think that view is held by the members of this House and by the country at large—we can only have an efficient war policy carried out with due regard to what we have already done, with due regard to the men who are at the front, and with due regard to their support, through one method, and that is the method of selective conscription.

Do we think that or do we not? The votes of this House, with 27 of them from the other side, affirm that most solemnly in this House and the votes of this House, with 27 from the party led by my right honourable friend voting along that line, reechoed the sentiment of this country—a sentiment that a man with red blood in his veins ought to have due respect for. They did not echo the sentiment of the slacker, of the soap-box orator on the streets of Montreal or in any other city. They did not represent the policy of Mr. Bourassa and Mr. Lavergne. They did not represent the policy of dozens of members on the other side of the House who supported my right honourable friend and who subscribed to the idea that Canada had done enough. There is no one here more glad, or more proud that Canada has done what she has done for the success of this war, than those who cast those votes, and by and large they represent the sterling national, loyal sentiment of this country from one end of it to the other. That, then, is the position to which we have come.

This franchise is meant to strengthen that sentiment. That is the purpose of this franchise and that is the purpose which I think it will achieve. Have we not a right to strengthen that sentiment? You say that 300,000 of our men have gone out from this country—the pick of its citizenship? That is true. Of these men, only a certain proportion can by any possibility give their votes. Not a single one of them can use his legitimate and usual influence in this country towards the determination of what the policy of the Government shall be. The dust of thirty thousand of these men lies silent on the other side of the ocean. Others are imprisoned, others are interned, and others are incapacitated in various ways.

When this country comes in a few months to register its voice as to whether those men shall be supported and this war

shall be efficiently carried on; when upon the register at the poll is found the name of John Smith, a loyal citizen of Canada who has taken the oath of allegiance to his sovereign, has enlisted in the forces, has gone to the front and has made the supreme sacrifice, and when he is not there to answer for it at the poll, his wife is there. She, who gave the husband of her youth, the support of her family, the father of her children says: "My husband has passed over in doing his duty, his name is called and I am here to answer." There is not an honourable gentleman on that side of the House and there is not an honest, straight forward, lover of his country in the whole domain of Canada, who would refuse that appeal of the wife of the husband who had given his life and was no longer here to say what should be the policy that should follow his sacrifice.

Hon. gentlemen on the other side of the House have admitted the justice of that appeal and they have little or no objection to this part of the Bill. But they cavil and find fault. They forget again, as I said at the first, that this is an abnormal condition of things under which we are acting. Although the mothers, wives, sisters and daughters of the soldiers who have gone into active service are admitted to have the right to represent their kith and kin, they will cavil, as my hon. friend from St. John does. He does everything possible to defeat this Bill, to minimize its importance, to raise objections to it, and to excite prejudice against it by doing what?—by saying: You have not been consistent; if you give to some women the right to vote, you should give it to all. The hon. gentleman opposes this measure because we did not go so far as to give it to all. There is where, I think, he makes the mistake of not taking into account that this is an extraordinary condition under which we find ourselves and that we are not legislating under normal conditions.

There is one point I want to make about that. There are noble, devoted women outside of those who have sent relatives to the front, who have done splendid service, but there are degrees in service and in sacrifice. There is the service and sacrifice of sympathy, which while it is not one of personal interest in the war, it is yet sympathetic with those who go to the front. There are hundreds and thousands of women who have made sacrifice and done service through sympathy. But there is a degree that is still higher, and these women would be the first to acknowledge it. That is the service and the sacrifice which is not simply emanating from sympathy, but which comes from heart strings wrung, which looks out of tear-bedimmed eyes, which comes from sleepless nights and anxious days, which comes from the part of flesh and blood and family that is far from them and which is exposed to constant danger. No one doubts that this kind of sacrifice and service is far higher than the other. That is the distinguishing line upon which we base this franchise Bill, and we trust to the good common sense of the people of this country to do away with those little refinements which the hon. member for St. John is so fond of indulging in and upon the main, broad question of distinctive right say that, "This is all that can be expected in war time, this is a right we freely concede to them and we will await our time until under normal conditions the whole franchise of this country can be put upon a permanent basis."

Let me go on to the other part of my right hon. friend's speech. My right hon. friend speaks of disfranchisement. You would think to listen to the speech of my right hon. friend to-night, that before a single Buckowinian or Slav started from his home in Europe, we sent an accredited member of this Government to sit down with him and that we concluded a treaty, signed, sealed and delivered, as to what he should get when he came to this country. An attempt is made to prove that because a man has certain information put into his hands in regard to the country to which he comes, that country enters into a solemn compact with him as an individual which might be comparable to a contract or treaty entered into between sovereign powers. Of course, nothing like that takes place. The man who leaves his distant home leaves to better himself. Probably the last thing he thinks about is what vote he is going to get or what voting power he is going to have in the country to which he goes. He goes to that country, becomes a citizen, has all its privileges. What is the use of trying to make it appear that those who are disfranchised under this Act are shorn of every right and privilege they had in this country? The man simply is asked to stand aside when the destiny of this country is being determined, to stand aside for the time being on account of relationship, of possible prejudice, of possible active sympathy with the enemies of this country.

That is all that he is asked. He keeps his liberty—not a bit of it is infringed upon. He has his security, he is as safe now, under all the laws of this country, as he was before; he has all his betterments, his prospects, his rights and his privileges. The simple one thing that he is asked to forego for this one war election is, when his own kith and kin are the enemies of this country and blood flows between them in one common vein, to consider that he is in a position where it is better for himself and better for this country that he shall stand aside for the time being. Why, if a jury is being called to try a man for his life, and one of the jurymen on being challenged allows it to become clear that he has a prejudice or has expressed an antipathy to, or an opinion adverse to the case of the man on trial—although he is a citizen, although he has all his rights, he stands aside without question and does not feel that any hardship is inflicted upon him. In this great national trial, when the destinies of this country are being decided, he is asked to do the same thing and to stand aside. He is not asked to fight, he is not asked to be a combatant, he is simply asked to forego one right; and I want to say that, so far as I judge it, it is the best thing possible for the man himself, and that it will in the end conduce more to a feeling of amity and of good will than if he were thrown into the arena of a political contest, to become the object of appeal by both parties. I believe that on that account he is in a position which lends itself more to future amity and good will than if he became a contestant in the political contest as it was going on.

My time is up and I shall take my seat, but before I do so, just one word. While this closure has been going on, I have come to the conclusion that this Parliament and every future Parliament would be wise if it adopted some rule by which we should keep discussion down to about twenty-five or thirty minutes for each member. By that means we should have a better House, we should have better debate, and we should do our work in one-half the time.

Hon. GEORGE P. GRAHAM (North Renfrew): In regard to the last remarks of my right hon. friend (Sir George Foster) so far as he is concerned I agree. I am inclined to think that when he is compelled to condense his speech into about twenty-five or twenty-six minutes, he gets at what he wants to say better than when he takes a long time to build a foundation on which he does not base his argument. My right. hon. friend has fallen into the habit lately, which has not deserted him in his twenty minute speech, of lecturing. He has not forgotten his old university days when his chief occupation was to lecture students. He looks over at us on this side of the House—and this is not the first time—and says we have lost our sense of proportion, we have not the interest in the war. I want to tell him that he does not know what interest in the war is.

Some hon. MEMBERS: Oh, oh.

Mr. GRAHAM: In the heart of hearts, where the heart strings are torn, he does not know what interest in the war is; and he has no right to lecture us in the House, any of us who have as much interest in the war as he possibly can have. I do not object to him advising, but when he takes on his air of lecturer to men on both sides of the House as to our lack of sense of proportion and not giving this war the prominence it should have, I say he is assuming a role for which he is not qualified.

My right hon. friend says he hates very much an election in war time. He was a party to sending ballots to Europe to have an election in war time, and he sat in the Government and allowed money to be expended, without authority I believe, to print ballots and rush them over to the Old Land to prepare for an election in war time, when we were in the midst of an appeal for recruits.

Sir ROBERT BORDEN: I would remind my hon. friend that that was done in pursuance of an Act of Parliament, and it was my hon. friend's advocacy of the passing of such an Act in the first instance that induced the Government to take it up.

Mr. GRAHAM: If my right hon. friend is not nearer right on most things than he is on this, I am not surprised that some people in his party are crying for leadership. There was no necessity for sending ballots to Europe for an election because there was an Act on the statute book. We have an Election Act on the statute book, but we are not peddling ballots, not having an election always. This Act was put on the statute book to provide for an election if it was called, and the fact that the Government intended to call it was proven by the other fact that they sent the ballots to Europe to be prepared for the election. My right hon. friend lectures us because he tells us that his party is the party to put the punch into efforts for the war.

Some hon. MEMBERS: Hear, hear.

Mr. GRAHAM: The way the hon. gentleman wants to put the punch into war efforts financially is by voting in this House to give a value to common stock that hon. gentlemen opposite themselves voted had no value, and to mulct the country in millions of dollars. The way the hon. gentleman wants to put the punch into war efforts is to vote to give his friends both in Toronto and Quebec millions in the Quebec and Saguenay railway, so much so that the member for Kingston (Mr. Nickle) revolted at it and had to vote against it. Another way in which he wishes to put the punch into war efforts is by voting a quarter of a million dollars for new telephone services merely for political purposes throughout Canada because an election is coming, although we had the pledge of the Finance Minister and the Minister of Public Works that no new work would be undertaken while the war was in progress.

Sir, the finances of this country are very important at the present time, and I want to say that the Government has at this session voted to squander millions of the people's money in a direction not at all required, at least during the war, and has taken the punch out of war efforts more than anything that the Opposition has done or could do.

Mr. LALOR: The Globe and Star did not say so.

Mr. GRAHAM: I am not particular what any paper said. I am making my own remarks and am prepared to stand by them. The Minister of Trade and Commerce also referred to the disfranchisement of certain citizens of Canada on the ground that it was for the safety of the State, and it has been said to me quietly that the reason I opposed this Bill is on account of a certain German vote in a certain constituency. I want to tell the House now for the first time that nearly all that German vote went for this Government's candidate, and a good many did so at the request of my hon. friend the Minister of Trade and Commerce, who was afraid of the drop of poison being infused into the body politic by my being returned. I want to tell him that the members of the Government now who speak so disparagingly of the German vote sent at least twenty men into the German settlement to live with the German people during the by-election in South Renfrew, and the Germans nearly all voted for the Government.

Mr. EDWARDS. They did not send the ballot papers.

Mr. GRAHAM: No, my hon. friend might have captured them on the way. The German vote, as we may call it, or the alien enemy vote as described by my hon. friend from Kingston (Mr. Nickle), in the West is not of German origin, or is not a real German vote as he described it, as coming under the law which he read as passed by Germany. The great majority of the vote referred to in the West I am told is Austrian and not German. So that the law my hon. friend read to-night as to their retaining their dual nationality does not apply to the vast number of men in the West, because these men are not Germans.

I want to refer to those of German origin in our own province of Ontario. The matter brought before the House by the hon. member for North Waterloo (Mr. Weichel) was brought to the attention of the House by the hon. member for North Perth (Mr. Morphy) the other night but it was brought up by the latter gentleman at fifteen minutes of two when this House was in committee, when there was no way of saving the franchise of these men in Ontario who have been here from twenty to forty years, but who have not gone through the formality of being naturalized. They always thought, up to the last municipal election in the city of Kitchener, that they were British subjects, and were always treated as such. I want to point out that I brought this subject to the attention of the committee in plenty of time to have this Act amended if I had had any support, but I got no support whatever from either of these two hon. gentlemen, although the question applied particularly to the counties of Waterloo and Perth—more so than to the county of Renfrew. On the 10th September, when we had plenty of time to have the Bill amended before we got to the third reading, I made the following remarks:

> There are men in this country who came from other lands, took up their residence here, and for twenty years they have been voting in Canada. Hon. members in this House can call them by name. They are good citizens, and they believed they had the right to vote. That right of citizenship was never questioned by either side of politics. When this war broke out, they discovered that, although they had been voting for many years, they had never gone through the formality of becoming naturalized. Being loyal citizens, and to show that they were true to the Union Jack and the British Empire, they immediately took out their naturalization papers.

I was wrong in that, and that matter was explained to-day. I said further:

> But they have only been naturalized two or three years. And although they have been building up this country, paying taxes and rais-

ing their families, although they are a credit to the country, by this Bill they find themselves disfranchised, and marked among their neighbours as men unworthy to be trusted with citizenship.

That was some days ago.

Mr. MORPHY: The hon. gentleman has not mentioned what people he is referring to. He has not used the word "German." Was he frightened to use that word?

Mr. GRAHAM: I said they were not Germans; they were Austrians. If the hon. gentleman reads my entire remarks he will find what I was talking about.

Mr. MORPHY: Pretty dry reading to wade through all the hon. gentleman has said.

Mr. GRAHAM: The hon. gentleman has done drier things than that since last September. I want to submit this question on the third reading. These men are in a different class from men of alien enemy origin who have come over to this country within the last few years. These men have been here for many years, spread over the province of Ontario, and exercising all the rights of citizenship and the rights of franchise. No person ever questioned those rights, and they never dreamed that they did not possess them. They look upon this measure as depriving them in an arbitrary manner of some right which was never disputed for many years. I think these men who have resided in Canada for a number of years, who voted regularly as citizens, might be allowed to retain their franchise. The men of the province of Ontario of German origin are among the best men we have in the province. Those of us who have gone through Ontario from end to end and have met these men would never dream of putting them in a class where there was the least semblance of disloyal utterance or action. And, if it is not too late yet, I would gladly support the Government in some amendment which would permit these men to retain their rights. I have appealed to these men and the Minister of Trade and Commerce has appealed to these men. We have addressed many audiences standing side by side and they have responded, they have contributed; and it seems hard that these old citizens of Canada should by this Act be deprived, notwithstanding their loyalty and devotion, of that which perhaps men hold among the dearest things of life, the right to exercise their franchise.

[Mr. Graham.]

Mr. MEIGHEN: Does the hon. gentleman mean men who are not yet naturalized?

Mr. GRAHAM: I do.

Mr. MEIGHEN: If so, they never had the right.

Mr. GRAHAM: You are talking technically and legally, but as a matter of fact, possession of almost anything gives you ownership after a number of years.

Mr. MEIGHEN: Oh, no.

Mr. GRAHAM: Speaking technically, these men never had the right, but they have exercised what they believed to be a right, and exercised it wisely for the last 30 years. They not only thought they had the right, but their neighbours thought it also. Neither this Government, nor any political party ever objected, because these men have been here so long they are landmarks in the section in which they reside.

Mr. LALOR: Does the hon. gentleman think anybody is going to prevent them voting more than before?

Mr. GRAHAM: They would be violating the law if they voted.

Mr. LALOR: They are in exactly the same position.

Mr. GRAHAM: My hon. friend says that, although he is going to support the law, he believes it is going to be violated. I say these men ought to have the right to vote as they always had, and I believe it is possible to frame the Bill to accomplish that object. What I object to generally, regarding this law—it was hinted at to-night by the Minister of Trade and Commerce, and it was intimated by the Secretary of State the other night, is that hon. gentlemen opposite are proceeding upon the principle, that there is but one loyal party in Canada. We are back to the days of the Family Compact, when a few people got together and said that the loaves and the fishes, the rights and the privlleges, of the people, indeed, everything belonged to this one party. Nothing was left to the remainder of the people except the duty of paying the taxes that the Family Compact levied upon them. According to the language of ministers, the principle is laid down that this Bill is expected to assist in electing friends of this Government and that in doing so it will assist in carrying on the war. If this is not the case, why prevent so many people in Canada from voting? Sir I re-

sent that. I do not think it is fair for a member of the Government to insinuate such a thing in this House. The time has gone by in Canada when thinking men will listen very seriously to that kind of talk; the history of Canada points in a very different direction. Under the leadership of the present leader of the Opposition, the first step towards closer union between the motherland and Canada was taken in the Imperial preference. During the years that the Minister of Trade and Commerce (Sir George Foster) was in charge of the Finance Department, he talks about an Imperial preference; his friends passed resolutions upon the subject, but they never took it into their active consideration. The first step, therefore, to give the motherland a preference in the Canadian markets was taken by the present leader of the Opposition. Moreover, the first man as head of a Canadian Government to provide troops to go across the water and help the motherland was the present leader of the Opposition. His predecessors had had similar opportunity, but had declined to take advantage of it; and some of the men who assisted the present Government to get into power in 1911 left the Liberal party on account of the then Prime Minister's action in that respect. The loyalty of the Liberal party in Canada should not be reflected upon. The history of the grand old Liberal party in the motherland is replete with incident after incident, act after act, showing that this party has been at the head of nearly every loyal movement launched in that great country. I resent being lectured on the ground that the Liberal party is not loyal. Since the beginning of the war gentlemen on this side of the House have supported every war measure that the Government brought forward, but they do balk at supporting a measure that is not a war measure; a measure that is devised to assist the Government in the coming election.

Mr. STEVENS: What about conscription?

Mr. GRAHAM: My hon. friend need not ask me anything about conscription. He talked about it where it was popular, but I supported conscription although in my constituency it was not popular.

Mr. STEVENS: That is the reason why you oppose it.

Mr. GRAHAM: Oppose what?

Mr. STEVENS: You oppose it because it is not popular in your constituency.

Some hon. MEMBERS: Wake up.

Mr. GRAHAM: The hon. gentleman has been asleep; I did not oppose conscription. Since the beginning of this war there have been no Liberals and no Tories so far as the sacrifice of the people is concerned. Members on this side of the House have done what they thought was right. I resent the imputation made by ministers that because a man happens to vote for a Liberal at the coming election he will be voting for a party that is not truly loyal and devoted to the interests of the Empire. We have disagreed on this side of the House as to details, but no one has shown more loyalty or more devotion to the Empire in the matter of carrying on the war than the leader of the Opposition. There is an endeavour to spread throughout the country the idea that the Tory party is the only party that is in favour of carrying on this war. That is not in the interests of the war; as a matter of fact, it is detrimental to the carrying on of the war enthusiastically—and hon. gentlemen know it.

In this war we are engaged in a great struggle; Grits and Tories, young men and older men, forgetting the differences at home, are struggling side by side for what they believe to be the best for mankind. Apparently we have come to the time when hon. gentlemen opposite are playing upon the feelings of the people throughout the Dominion in respect of that war for party purposes—and that is why this Bill is introduced. If this Bill meant winning the war or assisting to win it, I would support it. But no argument has been submitted to show that the Bill is designed to be of any assistance in carrying on the war. The Minister of Trade and Commerce made an eloquent appeal, as only he can, for the wives of the soldiers. Sir, we are all in favour of that. We are in favour of giving votes not only to the wives and female relatives of soldiers, but to the wives of their neighbours who are doing all they can to further the cause that we have at heart. Hon. gentlemen opposite are in favour of restricting the franchise; we are in favour of extending the franchise. The Governments of British Columbia, Alberta, Saskatchewan, Manitoba and Ontario, led by friends of hon. gentlemen, have granted to the women of their respective provinces the right to vote. We have always accepted the provincial qualification, but when it comes to winning the war, this Government balks at accepting the provincial qualification—as if the noble women of these provinces were not

as competent to vote in time of war as they are to vote in time of peace. Is the wife of the man who has contributed largely to patriotic and other funds connected with the war, to be denied the vote? Is the washerwoman who has sacrificed out of her mere pittance fifty cents a week for the Patriotic Fund not entitled to cast her ballot simply because she has no relatives to go to the front? Hon. gentlemen seem to have forgotten those words of commendation, "She hath done what she could." Sir, these women have done what they could. It is their misfortune that they are not able to send sons or brothers to the front. But their spirit has shown itself beyond doubt; if they had had relatives, those relatives would have gone to the front. It is not to the credit of this Government that, for some reason which they have not mentioned, they have deprived the women of these various provinces of the franchise that they would enjoy were it not for this Bill.

Mr. DONALD SUTHERLAND (South Oxford): Mr. Speaker, I do not rise to speak on the third reading of this Bill through any desire to hear the sound of my voice in this Chamber. I should not participate in this debate if I did not feel that the occasion was a most serious one. During a session in time of war, the discussions of questions that have come before this House have been greatly prolonged from day to day. If I expressed my opinion of some of the speeches that have been made, I am afraid, Sir, that you would call me to order.

The third reading of the War-Time Elections Act comes in conjunction with the two measures that have recently been put through the House, the Military Service Act, and the measure giving the soldiers the right to vote. The War-Time Elections Act is surely a necessary one, considering the conditions that confront the people to-day.

Since this war began there has been a strong feeling throughout Canada that we should have no election in this country as long as the war lasted, and no one voiced those sentiments more strongly than hon. gentlemen opposite and the Liberal press of the country. As the war went on, I believe that that feeling became even stronger. It is not so very long ago that the right hon. leader of the Opposition, protesting in the city of Toronto against the idea of holding an election during the war, said that he did not purpose opening the portals of office with a bloody key. A year ago a measure for the extension of the life of Parliament was passed unanimously by this House; we have practically reached the end of that extension. I say that if there was one reason then why there should be an extension of the life of Parliament, there are a hundred reasons for extending it to-day. Hon. gentlemen may say that there was no Military Service Bill before the House last year. Let me tell them that there was a Military Service Bill on the statute book at that time, and it was far more rigid than the one recently passed by this House. The measure recently passed was most reasonable compared with the Act on the statute book at that time.

I have listened to the right hon. leader of the Opposition and some of his colleagues to-night, and I say that the sentiments they have advanced are not in accordance with the sentiment of the people of this country, as I understand it. The right hon. leader of the Opposition stated a few minutes ago that this measure was a breach of faith with a portion of our population, and he went on to say, "My faith is in the German people," referring, of course, to the Germans who had come to this country. His statement to-night reminded me of a statement he made in the old Parliament Building not so very long ago, when the proposal of the Government for the building of three dreadnoughts was under consideration. He said:

> There is one fact in the situation which, I think, shows that there is no intention on the part of Germany to attack England, and that fact is the German Emperor.
>
> The German Emperor is undoubtedly one of the great men of the present age. By intellect, by character, by moral fibre, he has shown himself wonderfully endowed. In the first years of his reign some of his utterances sent a shiver through those who had the peace of the world at heart. Many believed that he was, perhaps, hankering for the glamour of military glory. But as he advanced in years, and as crisis after crisis came, his potent influence was always directed towards peace. And the day may come when, like his illustrious Uncle, our late King, he may be called the peace-maker.

I have always said that the man who has no regard for the country from which his ancestors came is not the best kind of a citizen. I believe that many of the people who have come out from Germany and settled in this country are prejudiced against our cause; their sympathies are naturally with the country from which they came. I say that no hardship or injustice is being done to these people by passing this Act at the present time. When the leader of the Opposition and the hon. mem-

ber for South Renfrew (Mr. Graham) say that an injustice is being done to these people who have been here for twenty or twenty-five years, they are saying something that is not in accordance with the facts, for these men will not be affected in the slightest degree by this Act. It is only those who have come here since 1902 who will be affected, and if these people who have been here twenty years are not naturalized now, it is their own fault.

Furthermore, when the hon. gentlemen opposite say we are doing an injustice to a large portion of the women of this country by depriving them of the franchise, they are making an equally erroneous statement, because the women of this country have never had the franchise, consequently, they cannot be deprived of it. No one in this country has protested more strongly against the granting of the franchise to the women of this country than the leader of the Opposition. In this House, not so very long ago, he protested against forcing the franchise upon the women of the province of Quebec, and he wanted a sort of patchwork affair conferring the franchise upon some women here and there. The Bill is granting the franchise to the wives, sisters and mothers of the soldiers who have gone overseas. It is a recognition of the services that have been rendered by these men. When you think of what these men have endured, and then think of the abuse hon. gentlemen opposite have heaped on some hon. gentlemen on this side of the House who have offered their services, fought in the trenches, and done everything possible to help win the war, I can come to no other conclusion but that it is a guilty conscience that made the hon. member for South Renfrew get up in this House and make the statements he did a few minutes ago, when he accused us of charging the Opposition in this House and the Liberal party with disloyalty. I have never said that they are disloyal. But I do say that the Liberal party in this country, and I know many of them, are ashamed of their leaders at the present time.

I want to say on behalf of the women of this country that they are not claiming that an injustice has been done to them in recognizing the wives and sisters and mothers and daughters of those who have gone to fight the battles of the Empire and of the 30,000 men who have already fallen in battle. On the contrary, many of them who were most active in urging that the franchise be granted to women have come forward and said that they are heartily in accord with the measure that has been introduced, and are prepared to wait for an extension of the suffrage until the war is over. But they say it is a right and proper thing that the soldiers' women relatives should be given the franchise.

Other speakers have pointed out the influence that 300,000 soldiers could exert in an election if they were present in Canada. As they are absent, it is only right and proper that their representatives here should have some say in the election. This is going to be a war-time election, and it necessitates the passing of a War-Time Elections Act. If there was no war on, hon. gentlemen opposite might have some cause for complaint. The right hon. leader of the Opposition says that this measure involves a breach of faith with those who have come from enemy countries and settled in Canada. Do these people expect the franchise at this time? They are not called upon to serve this country as combatants.

Hon. gentlemen opposite are protesting against compulsory military service. I say that the state has demands on the citizen which the citizen cannot escape when the life of the nation is at stake. It is the duty of every citizen to render every possible service to the state. It is the duty of the Government to see that that service is rendered, but not by going to those who are opposed to military service and asking them whether they would approve of it or not. Compulsory military service has been on the statute books for fifty years, and hon. gentlemen opposite, notwithstanding the efforts which have been made by the right hon. leader of the Government ever since he came back from the Old Country to form a union government by which we could avoid an election, have persistently refused to co-operate. They insisted on an election. They hoped that by reason of the disloyal element—and there is a disloyal element in this country—they hoped by a union of that element with the slackers and the hide-bound partisans whom they expected to support them, that they would gain the ascendancy, and that the leader of the Opposition would be able to open the portals of office even with a "bloody key."

I can quite understand that they feel to-day it would be a tremendous disadvantage to them if the female relatives of the soldiers overseas were recognized and given a voice in this election. They realize that many of those who are in sympathy with them are not going to be permitted to poll their votes in this election,

by reason of the fact that those people are not going to be called upon to serve in the war, and consequently are not going to be entitled to a voice in a war election. Canada is facing the most serious condition that ever confronted any people in this world, yet we are sitting here to-night, after a session of eight months, treating matters in a manner which I believe is not very much to the credit of some hon. members. Only a few minutes ago I heard the right hon. leader of the Opposition endeavour to censure an hon. member (Mr. Currie) who had served at the front, for certain remarks he had made here. The right hon. gentleman did not censure one of his supporters a short time ago when he made a statement with regard to the attitude of that hon. gentleman, sneering at a man who had raised a regiment in this country, and who had fought in Flanders and done everything he possibly could. The conscience of the hon. member for South Renfrew (Mr. Graham) must have been troubling him when he said that the Opposition in this House were charged with being disloyal. The situation is so serious that we cannot afford to treat it lightly.

I read an editorial in the Toronto Globe this evening, which shows there is a possibility of the Canadian divisions at the front being reduced, and that instead of the fifth division, which has been in England for some time, being sent overseas, drafts are being sent from it, and if conditions go on as they are at present, considering the number of casualties and the number of recruits, it is only a matter of a short time until the four Canadian divisions at the front will be reduced to three, then to two, and then, perhaps, disappear altogether. The issue at the present time is, are we going to continue in this war, or are we going to drop out of it? If we are going to treat this matter seriously we must realize that we are at war and are to have a war-time election. If we are to be forced into a war-time election we must take measures to see that the enemy within our country—and such there be—are not given an opportunity of throttling the men who are fighting our battles at the front. Let us see that the influence of those men overseas will, to some extent at least, be preserved by granting to their near relatives the right to exercise the franchise in this election.

If I had time I could refer to certain statements which have been made here by different members of the House. The right hon. leader of the Opposition spoke about unseemly attacks. Let me ask you, Mr. Speaker, if a more unseemly attack was ever made in this House or outside of it upon the Prime Minister of any country at a time when that country was at war, than was made upon the right hon. leader of the Government (Sir Robert Borden) by the hon. member from St. Mary's (Mr. Martin), who said:

> If anything happens in Montreal I shall be very sorry because I do not like trouble, but if any trouble happens the soldiers will be responsible for it.

Further on he said:

> If anything happens, if blood flows in the streets of Montreal or in any other city, the fault will be with the Prime Minister and with those who helped him pass the law.

Those are the sentiments of the supporters of the right honourable leader of the Opposition, yet he does not reprove the men who make such statements but casts aspersions upon the actions of a man who has served at the front, and whom I saw leaving Valcartier with as fine a regiment as ever left the shores of any country, a man who acquitted himself in one of the most difficult positions in which anyone was ever placed in a manner which has never been found fault with by any of the men who were with him; yet some politicians who wished to ruin this man's reputation endeavoured to make it appear that he had not done his duty on that occasion. Does the right honourable leader of the Opposition censure his followers for an attack of that kind? Does he censure the honourable member from St. Mary's when he makes an attack upon the Prime Minister of this country? No. But he finds it convenient and it suits his cause to make the attack he has made here to-night. When the honourable member for South Renfrew (Mr. Graham) endeavoured to reprove the Minister of Trade and Commerce (Sir George Foster) as he did here to-night, he never presented a more sorry spectacle in this House.

In conclusion, I want to say that I consider it would have been a crime if we had not passed a War-time Election Act. It would have been a crime that would forever redound to our shame if we had allowed anything to happen in this country that would curtail our effors in this war, if we had allowed such a combination as I have referred to, and allowed the Opposition to attain the objects they hoped to attain as a result of that combination. The War-Time Election Act is before us and I am sure it will satisfy the people of this country.

Mr. F. N. McCREA (Sherbrooke): Mr. Speaker, before the Prime Minister went to

England he declared on several occasions that conscription would never be resorted to here. When he came back, he had evidently changed his mind. It is plain that he found conditions on the other side such as to indicate that more effort and more force would have to be put into this war. They said their sole intention was to win the war. Let us review what has taken place since that time and see whether the action has justified the pretension. We are told that actions speak louder than words. If we analyse the actions and means resorted to by the Government, we shall find that it is not the winning of the war that is uppermost in their minds but the winning of the election. The right honourable Minister of Trade and Commerce told us practically that they were the only true and loyal people in this country, that they have been the loyal party and the only party capable of putting the necessary energy, force and drive into the war. He further told us that the people were behind them in this matter. If the Government believe that they have the confidence of the people and that the people are behind them as the win-the-war party, why are they resorting to such methods as these? Why do they resort to the expedient of disfranchising a lot of people who are true and loyal citizens and proceed to enfranchise a lot of other people who never asked to be enfranchised, never thought of it and do not want it? When the right honourable Prime Minister (Sir Robert Borden) came back from England he said that he believed that the time had arrived when we should put forth a greater effort, and that that effort could not be put forth without a coalition Government, because he declared that a conscription Bill could not be legitimately carried out by any one party. I am not going to give the Prime Minister credit for having any great amount of diplomatic ability, but I still think he is too shrewd and wise to have gone about the formation of a coalition government in the way in which he did if he meant what he said. He said that he had come to the conclusion that we had to have more recruits, that a greater effort was to be put forth and that the first step in that direction was the formation of a coalition government. If he believed that, instead of going into this House and announcing his conscription measure, why did he not call my right honourable friend (Sir Wilfrid Laurier) into his councils, give him his confidence and state to him the conditions which he found. The conditions which the Prime Minister says he found overseas were very different from what he believed them to be before he went away. When he went away he said that conscription would not be resorted to, but when he came back he said that conscription was necessary. If the right honourable gentleman had believed that, the first thing he, as an intelligent and sensible man, would have done, would have been to call in the leader of the Opposition and lay before him the condition that he found overseas and say: Now, cannot we come to some arrangement for the formation of a coalition, or union government so that we may carry this war to a successful conclusion? He did not do that. He first announced his conscription measure, knowing well that the leader of the Opposition was a man of very strong views upon some things and that he had an aversion to compulsion in any form. He knew he was a man who had spent nearly his whole life in trying to bring the different elements in this country together by persuasion, and that he would not favour a resort to force unless it was finally and absolutely necessary. Did that show that the leader of the Government wanted a coalition government? It did not. The fact of his announcing a policy that he knew beforehand the leader of the Opposition was opposed to, instead of taking him into his confidence, would indicate that it was not a coalition, or win-the-war government that he had in his mind, but that what he desired to do was to bring about a dividing of parties in this country.

Then he brings in the Military Voters' Act. Nobody finds any fault with the proposal to give every soldier of Canadian birth a vote. He is entitled to it. Nobody would object to the wife, sister, mother, or daughter, of a man who had lost his life being enfranchised. It is only common sense and reason that the man who is at the front should have the right to vote. He has the right to vote under this Act, and that being so, why should five or six of his sisters have the right to vote? I have in my mind the case of a young man who is at the front. He has seven sister and a mother. He will have a vote himself and the seven sisters and the mother will each have a vote—nine votes in all. Is there any reason for this unless you give votes to other women? There are men enlisting in the Canadian ranks who never saw Canada but

who enlisted on the other side. They probably wanted to go to the war, and like intelligent people they enlisted where they got the best pay. They did not enlist for the sake of getting the vote, they were not asking for the vote. These men have never seen Canada and have no interest in Canadian affairs. They are interested, as British subjects, in winning the war and they did not enlist for the purpose of getting the vote. They may vote wherever they are placed by the machine. Does that indicate that the Government believe that the people are behind them? They tell us that they are the only true and loyal people, that they are the only people who can carry this war to a successful issue. They say that the people of Canada are behind them. Yet they resort to these methods.

Mr. MORRIS: May I ask the hon. gentleman a question?

Mr. McCREA: No sir; I am talking now. The next matter brought up in this House probably had nothing to do with military matters, that was the question of the formation of a coaliton Government. The Government wanted somebody to join them and take the curse off their shoulders, the Canadian Northern Railway Bill. The Minister of Finance (Sir Thomas White) in this House on different occasions stood up almost with tears in his eyes—I was not very close to him and my sight is not good, but from his trembling voice I think he had tears in his eyes—and deplored the fact that when they came into power they inherited a terrible load of woe in the railway system. Probably there is something in that, that railway construction had been overdone. But I ask if the fact that we have had more expenditure on railways, which in some cases paralleled each other, than was really justified, is a reason for passing legislation to place a value on stock that has no value according to the report of a Commission appointed by this Government.

Mr. CURRIE: I think the rules of the House are being transgressed.

Mr. McCREA: I think I am as near my subject as you were. You talked about yourself, saying you were at the front when other people said you were hiding.

Mr. DEPUTY SPEAKER: I think the hon. gentleman should come back to the subject.

Mr. McCREA: I am nearer to it now than he was; he spent his whole time talking about himself. During the discussion of the Canadian Northern Railway Bill, the Minister of Finance read out a list of the directors of the Canadian Bank of Commerce. I do not know what connection the Canadian Bank of Commerce has with the Canadian Northern Railway Bill, but he read that out. I wish to say that I am not now and never was a director of the Bank of Commerce, but if I was, that would not be a justification of my voting to rob the people of this country to reimburse either the Canadian Northern railway or the Bank of Commerce.

This Franchise Bill disfranchises about 50,000 people ratepayers property owners, naturalized citizens, many of whom have taken the oath of allegiance. If I understood the Prime Minister rightly, he intimated that for such of those as were naturalized and had taken the oath of allegiance and had always behaved well, some way of qualifying might be found. I was wondering if they would take the oath of allegiance to the Tory party instead of to the King, it would not be a better qualification to give them a vote at the present time.

Sir GEORGE FOSTER: It is worth taking into consideration.

Mr. McCREA: The Canadian Northern Railway Bill, whatever the award may be, whether it is one dollar or $30,000,000, is just so much money stolen from the people of this country, and the Quebec and Saguenay railway is very much in the same category. This franchise Bill proposes to enfranchise all the female relations of soldiers, whether the soldiers are alive and voting for themselves or whether they are dead. I think every fair-minded man would say without hesitation that the wife or sister of any man who has lost his life at the front should have the right of voting; but I do not believe that the women whose sons or brother are at the front are much concerned about voting. I have one son at the front, and he is not one of the rear guards in London either; he is in the front line in France and has been since May. I trust he is still living. He has a mother at home.

Mr. DAVIDSON: What is his view on conscription?

Mr. McCREA: I do not know what his views on conscription are, but if he is like his father he is in favour of all just and fair measures, and I think he is likely to

follow his father's example. I wish to tell you that his mother is not worrying about votes. She is knitting, working for him and other boys, most of her time when she is awake and dreaming about him when she is asleep. She has troubles enough without worrying about politics or about how the vote will go, and I think it is heaping injustice on the women of this country to ask them to take a part in politics. They have troubles enough at this time without being called upon to take part in the political struggles of this country. However, I have no objection to the mothers, sisters, daughters or other womenkind of soldiers having a vote. But I say it is an injustice, and I think you will reap the reward of your injustice when the time comes—I am not worrying about this thing—it is unjust and unreasonable and a blot on the fair name of Canada, to send agents to foreign countries and invite men to come to this country and settle, promising them that they will have the right of citizenship and enjoy all the privileges of British subjects, and at this particular time, when the Government is heaping on all kinds of taxes, and our taxation is only beginning, and although we place this burden on these men not allow them to have anything to say as to how the money shall be spent. It is the fact that this Government feel down in the bottom of their heart and their soul that they have not the confidence of the people of this country that they are placing this unfair, unjust and disgraceful legislation on the statute-book.

Mr. L. A. LAPOINTE (St. James, Montreal): I rise again to protest against the passing of this Bill. I said on one occasion that I represent the city of Montreal where there are a lot of law-abiding citizens who will be affected by this Bill which disfranchises thousands of men who have been accustomed to live with us, paying their taxes, and being as law-abiding citizens as the best class of citizens in Montreal.

People imagine that men in the city of Montreal may be all alike. It is not so. Those who have been attacking the Government have been attacking Sir Wilfrid Laurier and myself in the same manner. These men do not count. I am speaking on behalf of quite a number of Jews of German descent, and many others. I have received many communications from these gentlemen asking me to protest. They are not very quiet men and they are not going to take this matter as easy as the electors of my hon. friend from North Waterloo (Mr. Weichel) do. I do not know whether that hon. gentleman has authority to speak for the electors and to say that they would be satisfied with what he appealed to the Prime Minister to give them. The men in Montreal of whom I speak are not going to be satisfied with that. On one occasion my hon. friend from North Waterloo told the House what his people were doing. He said that a thousand men in North Waterloo enrolled, and 300 of those who went to the front were boys of German descent. Is he asking that these people should have the right of citizenship, but no vote? Is he content with the statement of the Prime Minister that he would pass an Order in Council and give them some right of living, but not the right of representation, though they pay taxes? The Government continue to collect taxes from these disfranchised people in Montreal just the same, and yet all these people will have no right to vote. I call this Bill a measure of expediency. You have only to look at three or four pages of the Bill, and you find nothing but enumerators. We see provision for thousands of enumerators, and they are to be given the right to do whatever they please. We never had such a thing in our province. In my constituency there are many polling subdivisions. One polling subdivision has only four electors, but there will be an enumerator for that subdivision. In one part of my ward there are nine polling subdivisions, with 196 electors. There will be nine enumerators for that district. There will be 3,000 enumerators in Montreal, friends of the Government.

Mr. PUGSLEY: They will get their work in.

Mr. L. A. LAPOINTE: You bet they will work up to the day of the election, because they have the right to send anybody to the poll to vote. The returning officer, with the enumerator, and some assistant returning officers will prepare the list, and hon. gentlemen can see where we will stand with an election at this time. This Bill, as I have said, is a measure of expediency, to win an election. To win the war is another question. The war will not be won by this Government or the other government. The hon. gentleman from North Waterloo (Mr. Weichel) read from some paper a statement that the women of his county were not opposing the measure, but were satisfied, and that statement was placed on Hansard. He showed himself so satisfied in every way

with the Bill that I am convinced it is more partisanship than anything else that satisfies him. I desire to place on record a protest against the Franchise Bill, and I take the report in to-day's Montreal Gazette. It reads:

At a meeting of the Equal Suffrage League in the Royal Arcanum Chambers last evening, the various speakers criticised the Federal Government and Sir Robert Borden over the Franchise Bill which is at present being discussed in the House of Commons. Although the meeting was not of a political nature, the presence of a few men gave it the air, at one stage, of a partisan gathering. The business before the meeting was the report of Mrs. Rose Henderson of the reception by Sir Robert Borden of the deputation which went to Ottawa early in the week to advance their views on the new Franchise Bill. After everything had been said about the franchise question, discussion drifted until toward the close, Food Controller Hanna came in for some sharp criticism.

About thirty persons attended the meeting, most of whom were women. All, with the exception of two men, seemed to be in sympathy with the views expressed and the action which had been decided upon.

None of the ladies who spoke claimed to be close relatives to soldiers on active service and consequently enfranchised by the proposed law.

In speaking of the delegation's work at Ottawa, Mrs. Rose Henderson declared that they had gone down to meet the Prime Minister on short notice, as the Franchise Bill was being rushed through, and they wished to discuss it with the Government leader before it finally passed. She said that the deputation felt that the bill was anti-democratic, and was a direct refutation of the facts, for which men have been sent overseas. "I don't think such an autocratic measure has ever passed the Canadian House of Commons, as this one," said Mrs. Henderson. "According to the terms of the bill a large proportion of men will be disfranchised, while there is also a tremendous discrimination in the case of women. Why is it that women who have worked for the Red Cross and for the Patriotic Fund are deprived of the vote by this measure?"

Continuing, Mrs. Henderson stated that the deputation wanted to know why the Government could only trust soldiers' relatives, and not Canadian women who have been doing more than their share to help win the war. It was for these reasons that they decided to go to Ottawa and ask Sir Robert to explain.

Mrs. Henderson then gave her report of the meeting with the Prime Minister. She said that he gave them a long lecture on how and why they were to be discriminated against. Women, said the Premier, are not citizens. Until they came into full possession of citizenship, he did not see how they could have the ballot. He also declared that according to the Imperial Council meeting in 1914, certain naturalization laws had been passed, and as a result of these any woman who married a man of foreign birth or citizenship had to accept the naturalization of her husband, that is, if a Canadian-born woman married a German, she herself became German. Because of this, Sir Robert considered it an injustice to give these women the ballot. However, after this he assured the delegation that if he was returned to power at the coming elections, he would give the women a limited franchise.

[Mr. L. A. Lapointe.]

On asking the Premier what he meant by a limited franchise, they were answered that a woman to qualify for the ballot after the war would be required to reside in Canada for a period of five years, and also have educational qualifications. The latter would be most important. The delegation then asked Sir Robert if the women whom he had enfranchised by the new Bill were required to possess these qualifications, but he replied in the negative.

Mrs. Henderson then declared that the delegation, therefore, came to the conclusion that the new Franchise Bill was not a measure of right, but simply an expedient measure; not so much to win the war as to win the election. She said it was ridiculous to have women of Russian or Polish birth who could not speak a word of English, and who had only lived in Canada perhaps for a few months before the war, given the right to vote, while women who have been living here all their lives and who have been working for the good of their country were deprived of it.

Sir Robert Borden, continued Mrs. Henderson, agreed that the present Bill was an injustice to the women of Canada. He showed that even his wife, who had been doing a good deal of patriotic work, and the wife of Hon. Martin Burrell, would be unable to vote. He said that the measure would have to go through, and the only thing the women of Canada could do was to wait and hope. Sir Robert said that many soldiers have died on the battlefield and as a result their principles and ideas should be expressed through their widows or nearest relatives.

Mrs. Weir, who spoke next, said that according to the outlook it seemed as if a military caste was being formed in Canada. She told the audience that the latest rumour she had heard was to the effect that the Government had told the soldiers in France that if the present Government was returned to power, all the soldiers would be given free passage and six months' leave of absence.

Mrs. Henderson, who presided, replied that there was no doubt but that the Government is trying to get elected by every possible means. "The Government," she continued, "has set a bad precedent by depriving a number of peaceful citizens from voting at a time which they consider to be a crisis. What is to prevent a government in the future from saying that there is a tremendous crisis when they desire to pass an important measure, and take the vote away from some other people who happen to be interested in the question contrary to the Government's wishes?" said Mrs. Henderson.

Mr. A. Lanouette, the first gentleman to speak, said that the Franchise Act was certainly an injustice, and also an insult. "It is nothing else than a political action. It is power they want, and power under any circumstances." In his opinion the Equal Suffrage League ought to organize immediately, agitate, and call public meetings similar to the one in Verdun last week, to place the issue before the people. "An open air meeting looks pretty good," he said.

"We might be arrested," said Mrs. Weir.

"No danger in Verdun—all the policemen are our friends," he answered.

After this one man in the audience sharply attacked the meeting for criticizing the Government during such a crisis. He said that everybody should join together at a time like this and help win the war. The question of

votes for women could be argued out after the war had been won, because "if we did not win we would be a crushed people and nothing would matter," he said.

Mrs. Rose Henderson then took the matter of public meetings up, and it was decided that a meeting be held at the corner of Ethel and Church streets, in Verdun, on Saturday night. Another meeting will be held on Phillips' Square on Monday evening. Speakers will be secured to address the audiences, and both sides of the franchise question will be discussed.

You can see that there is going to be quite a lot of discussion in Montreal about that. The article continues:

After the question of meetings had been decided upon, discussion drifted towards the food question and the food controller. Mrs. Henderson gave a vivid picture of conditions among the poorer classes in Montreal, where people had neither bread nor butter. 'We have a food controller who is a huge joke," said the speaker. "The only thing he is controlling is the appetites of the people. He advocates eating fish on two days of the week, and as a result fish dealers raise their prices on those days." The food controller, in Mrs. Henderson's opinion, has failed lamentably, and until a really capable man was given charge of the question she did not think that things would take any turn for the better.

It is useless for me to appeal to hon. gentlemen on the other side of the House with regard to this Bill, because they have made up their minds that it shall go through. When the Bill was in committee we offered many suggestions by way of amendment, but only those that had been prepared in advance by the Secretary of State could pass. We suggested that in the city of Montreal the polls be kept open until seven or eight o'clock in the evening, but the Government would not accept that suggestion. Everything was cooked in advance; everything was ready, and as a final touch the gag was applied.

Hon. T. W. CROTHERS (Minister of Labour): Mr. Speaker, the right to vote is not a natural right, nor has it ever been so regarded by any legislature or any state. It is conferred by legislation and never anywhere upon all the people. Speaking generally, persons under twenty-one years of age have not been given it, nor have judges. Aliens, Indians, criminals or those being maintained by public charity. At our last election in 1911 only one-quarter of the people in Canada were entitled to vote, and that right had been given to them by legislation. Consideration must always be had to the conditions existing in the country. The question of the franchise is a matter not of theory, but of conditions. No statesman establishing a government in Central Africa would think of enfranchising the natives. It is generally conceded, I think, that our cousins across the line were unwise in granting the franchise to the coloured man before he was fairly qualified to exercise it. Conditions affecting the interests of the State determine to whom the right to vote shall be given. To-day very exceptional and abnormal conditions prevail. What are they? The safety and independence of Canada, the honour and integrity of the Empire, and the liberties of humanity, are in danger. If the Central Powers finally win the war everything for which life is worth living will be lost by us. The question to be determined in this election is as to whether we shall continue in this war or whether the war shall cease so far as we are concerned.

For three years a majority of the people of this country of both political parties have struggled valiantly for the preservation of these priceless possessions. Loyal Liberals have shown no less anxiety than Conservatives to win this war, and to that end have contributed of men, means and service no less generously than Conservatives. All classes alike mourn the loss of loved ones fallen. Parents, wives and children in all ranks of life in common sorrow weep for those who never shall return but they all find solace in the thought that their men died bravely in a rightful cause; others suffer with anxiety for those still surrounded by death and danger.

The war is the thought uppermost in the minds of people everywhere, and one has to come to Parliament to find anyone worrying about anything else. But here we find men obsessed with the illfounded anticipation of the enjoyment of the pride of office. Some months ago I expressed the opinion that there were men more anxious to win the treasury benches than to win the war, and the opinion I then expressed has since developed into a firm conviction. These men, however, will be rudely awakened to find that the paramount question is, shall we continue the contest and maintain to the end the glorious record our brave men have already won for us or shall we at home declare to the world that we are unworthy of them, that we are sluggards or worse? Shall we sacrifice our all, disgrace our country in the face of the world, dishonor our heroes dead and desert our soldiers living? Our national honor is involved. Shall we go forward or quit? That is the issue to be determined within the next few months by the electors to be designated by this Bill.

Could the people of this country rest in the conviction that whatever the result of

the approaching election, the Government of Canada will continue a vigorous participation in the war, they might properly consider questions of lesser magnitude. Were they satisfied that the leader of the Opposition and his followers are as determined that Canada shall continue to do her duty in this war as are the leader of the Government and his supporters, they would probably rest content with a peace time election, for their chief concern would be attained whatever the result, and the extension or restriction of the franchise would not be of so much importance. But they are not so satisfied. On the contrary the evidence seems conclusive, as well concerning the attitude of the leader of the Opposition himself, as that of his chief supporters, that for Canada's effective contribution in the winning of the war it is essential that the Government be sustained. It is well known and everywhere admitted that Sir Robert Borden and all the supporters of the Government will, to the last ounce of strength, sustain our brave men fighting, while all the anti-war elements in the country will be ranged up behind the leader of the anti-war Liberals, himself encouraging their attitude, at least to the extent of refusing to denounce it. If the Government is sustained the war will proceed with renewed vigour; if the Opposition win, our participation in the war will virtually cease. Is there any doubt about that? Does any sane man believe that the leader of the Opposition could or would vigorously prosecute the war, relying chiefly for support upon men avowedly opposed to it, supplemented by all the anti-British, pro-Germans, slackers, and all those Liberals more partisan than patriotic, in the country? Water cannot rise higher than its source. Can any one of clear vision imagine the leader of the Opposition, the hon. member for Rouville (Mr. Lemieux), and the hon. member for Pictou (Mr. Macdonald), reviewing a battalion for overseas, the hon. member for Maisonneuve (Mr. Verville) being standard bearer, and commanded by the hon. member for St. Hyacinthe (Mr. Gauthier), who boldly tells us his constituents are ready to rebel rather than obey the law, and that he is ready to lead them?

Mr. L. P. GAUTHIER: I never said that.

Mr. CROTHERS: On page 2662 of Hansard the hon. member (Mr. Gauthier) said:

> Before resuming my seat I shall be very frank with the House. I want to make a few remarks in the name of my people. This is one of the most solemn hours of my life. It may be the last opportunity I shall have of addressing the House of Commons and my country. I say to the Government, if you press this measure through, my people, declaring that this Government has no mandate, will use the very Bill itself to fight the matter out. We acknowledge that in this fight there will be pain and suffering. We may have to go to the direst consequences. My people are willing to go to the limit if you impose upon them such a piece of legislation; I believe they are right, and I will do as they intend to do.

Mr. GAUTHIER: Is that rebellion?

Mr. CROTHERS: That means they are prepared to rebel rather than obey the law. The leader of the Opposition accepted, with apparent approval, that statement from one of his leading supporters—at least we have heard from him no expression of reprimand, disapproval or repudiation. He is willing to receive in silence any influence such perfidious utterance may bear him.

But has the leader of the Opposition himself shewn any burning anxiety that we should earnestly participate in the war? It is true he has asserted in this House and elsewhere that he is in this conflict to the end. But one may safely predicate what a man will do to-morrow from what he did yesterday. This war cannot be won by honied words or cheap and sonorous phrases. Deeds avail rather than words. "By their fruit shall ye know them." Instead of doing anything to strengthen us in the conflict, his conduct since the beginning of the war has tended to encourage the enemy. He has never lost an opportunity of declaring to the people of Canada and to the world that everything done by the Government, whether in prosecuting the war or otherwise, was all wrong. Everything proposed by the Government is villainous in his eye. Since the war session of 1914 I do not remember him to have expressed approval of a single thing done by the Government. Did such conduct on the part of the leader of the Opposition tend to strengthen our hands in the great struggle?

I well remember his declaring in this House in 1910, "If England were in danger, yea, if she were even menaced, I would go upon every platform in my native province and urge my compatriots to shed their last drop of blood for the preservation of British liberty." Noble sentiment! But when the testing day came, where was he found? Sniping, faultfinding, obstructing, preaching bi-lingualism, encouraging disunion and opposing conscription.

Both England and Canada for the last three years have been menaced and in danger, but what real anxiety has he shown for the preservation of British liberty or Canadian safety? None whatever. In this conflict a

patriot more anxious for his country's weal than for his personal advantage would cast about to find where his services would be most effective, and, having found it, proceed to render them with all his strength. Had he so acted, we should have found him doing in Quebec in 1915, 1916 and 1917 what in 1910 he said he would do, namely, go upon every platform in his native province and urge his compatriots to shed their last drop of blood for the preservation of British liberty. Had he fulfilled that promise, there would have been no need for conscription. A man possessed of a burning desire to attain a certain end manifests it in deeds, and is not content with words, however eloquent. For months he has had time and strength to lead and encourage obstruction to the Military Service and other Bills, but he has had during the last years no time or strength to induce his people in Quebec to do their duty. " By their fruits ye shall know them." According to his lieutenant from South Renfrew, the hon. gentleman who spoke this morning, and whose speech delivered at the picnic a few days ago was reported, if the leader of the Opposition were made leader of the Government he will take off his coat and proceed to the province of Quebec and fulfil his promise of 1910, and secure recruits by the thousands. That is, he will do his duty if you make him leader of the Government, but, as leader of the Opposition, no such duty devolves upon him. The hon. member for South Renfrew is the gentlemen who with 26 others a few days ago said that conscription was necessary to reinforce our men at the front, and voted for conscription. Yet to-day he is going to the country as supporting a man who is opposed to conscription. He said that conscription was actually necessary to enable us to continue the war. Now he is supporting a man who says: I will not have anything to do with conscription. That is, he will do his duty if you make him leader of the Government, but as leader of the Opposition no such duty devolves upon him. Strong evidence of patriotism and statesmanship that.

1 a.m.

Mr. PUGSLEY: Whose speech is the hon. gentleman reading from?

Mr. CROTHERS: I am not reading from a conviction for manipulating and misappropriating trust funds in connection with the purchase of a saw dust wharf.

Mr. PUGSLEY: I rise to a point of order. If the hon. gentleman is in his right mind to-night he is guilty of slander of the worst possible description.

Some hon. MEMBERS: Order, order.

Mr. PUGSLEY: The statement he has made has not a particle of truth in it——

Some hon. MEMBERS: Order.

Mr. PUGSLEY: It is absolutely false in every particular——

Some hon. MEMBERS: Order, order.

The DEPUTY SPEAKER: I have not noticed the hon. minister (Mr. Crothers) accuse any one.

Mr. PUGSLEY: We all know what he referred to——

Some hon. MEMBERS: Oh, oh.

Mr. CROTHERS: How quickly he recognizes an old accomplice.

Mr. PUGSLEY: ——and I repeat it is an act of slander unworthy of any member of this House.

Some hon. MEMBERS: Order, order.

Mr. PUGSLEY: I repeat it in the strongest language possible. The hon. gentleman ought to know better.

Mr. BUREAU: Let him read his conscription speech . He had not time to make it.

The DEPUTY MINISTER: The hon. minister has not referred to any particular member on the other side of the House. I do not think the hon. member for St. John has the right to call it slander.

Mr. PUGSLEY: I rose to a point of order, and I characterized the remark as slanderous——

Some hon. MEMBERS: Order, order.

Mr. PUGSLEY: —and false——

Some hon. MEMBERS: Order, order.

Mr. PUGSLEY: —and cowardly——

Some hon. MEMBERS: Order, order.

Mr. PUGSLEY: —and I repeat it. You cannot get away with stuff like that.

Mr. CROTHERS: The reference I made was proved to the hilt in this House a few years ago. I will not take the time to go over it.

Mr. PUGSLEY: I deny that absolutely, Mr. Speaker. The hon. minister must know his statement is false, or he ought to know——

Mr. CROTHERS: The sterling people of this country will not be deceived by any such buncombe.

Some hon. MEMBERS: Time.

Mr. CROTHERS: No, my time is not up yet. The leader of the Opposition has several times said that the introduction of the Military Service Act threw the apple of discord into this House, that it would make for disunion between the two races in Canada, and that every effort should be made to preserve union and harmony between them. "Preserve" is not the proper word in that connection——

Mr. LAFORTUNE: (translation): I rise to a point of order. I see that the hon. gentleman is reading his speech, which is not allowed by the rules of this House.

Some Hon. MEMBERS: Order.

Mr. DEPUTY SPEAKER (translation): Would the hon. gentlemen be kind enough not to interrupt?

Mr. LAFORTUNE: (translation): I ought to be allowed to rise to a point of order.

Mr. DEPUTY SPEAKER (translation): If the hon .gentleman does not stop interrupting, I shall have to name him.

Mr. LAFORTUNE: (translation): You may name me if you choose, but that does not give the minister the right to read his speech.

Mr. BOIVIN: (translation): Should not the hon. member for Montcalm be allowed to rise to a point of order, as any other member of this House?

Mr. DEPUTY SPEAKER (translation): The hon. gentleman is not rising to a point of order; he is stating that the time of the hon. minister has expired.

Mr. LAFORTUNE: (translation): I am not stating that the time of the minister has expired; I say that the minister is reading his speech.

Mr. CROTHERS: I was about to say "preserve" is not the proper word——

Mr. LAFORTUNE (translation): I demand your decision upon this point of order.

Mr. CROTHERS: "Preserve" is not the proper word in that connection, because such union and harmony has never existed, does not exist now, and never will exist until our patriotic vision—

Some hon. MEMBERS: Order, order.

Mr. CROTHERS:—embraces the Empire as well as all Canada—until we all become nationalists in the true sense of the word.

as distinguished from provincialists and racialists—until we all realize that we are living in the twentieth rather than in the eighteenth century.

Some hon. MEMBERS: Order, order.

The DEPUTY SPEAKER: Will the hon. Minister kindly use his notes as reference.

Mr. CROTHERS: It is vain to say—

Mr. BOIVIN: I rise to a point of order. A ruling has just been given to the effect that the hon. Minister had no right to read from his notes.

Mr. SPEAKER (having taken the Chair): The rule is a member cannot read his speech. He is permitted to have reference to his notes.

Mr. CROTHERS: We have had to listen to members on the other side of the House during the last week and during the last month who have read their speeches in full. Some hon. gentlemen do not appear to appreciate what is being said. I was about to say, it is vain to say at the same time, that one is in favour of conscription and is supporting the leader of the Opposition who is opposed to it.—

Some hon. MEMBERS: Time.

Mr. CROTHERS: —and who if he were returned as leader of this House would not adopt conscription and could not get any recruits by any other means, so that, those who are in favour of conscription cannot consistently support the leader of the Opposition. That is confirmed by a statement I read a short time ago in the Toronto Globe, the leading and most influential Liberal paper in Canada. Let me read what it said on the eighth day of this month, that every man in this country who is opposing conscription is encouraging Canada to drop out of the war.

Mr. SPEAKER: The hon. member's time is up.

Mr. W. H. BENNETT (East Simcoe): Mr. Speaker, in the absence of any honourable gentleman on the other side of the House having anything to say of an uncomplimentary nature about this Bill, I will trespass upon the attention of the House to say something complimentary. Anybody who has heard the debate to-night would not realize that there was a question as to whether or not there should be a franchise Bill in this country. Hon. gentlemen have drifted far afield in discussing the Bill and the reason is plain. They are so mortally afraid to condemn the policy that they

are afraid to say anything about it. There has been but one hon. gentleman on the other side of the House who has demurred to soldiers' wives being included amongst those who should have votes, and that one hon. gentleman is the hon. member for Sherbrooke (Mr. McCrea). I challenge any hon. gentleman on the other side of the House to say that he objects to the wives, daughters, sisters and mothers of the soldiers having votes. They will not do it because they know it is right and while they argue by the hour that females generally should have votes they have not sufficient confidence in themselves to move an amendment to that effect. It is all humbug and hon. gentlemen opposite realize that. They are living on humbug and nothing else. One knows that from listening to their speeches in the House. The hon. member for Moosejaw (Mr. Knowles) addressed the House, and when he was getting towards the close of his remarks, as Hansard will show, he turned around to the hon. member for South Renfrew (Mr. Graham) and to hon. gentlemen from the West and from different parts of Canada, who had supported the Government on the conscription Bill, and declared that they were all voting to save their own necks and that there was no principle in them. There was not one of them who had the common honesty to get up and say that he was voting on principle on the matter. Yet, they will go out to different places in this country and tell the people that their vote in the House was not an honest vote and that while they voted for conscription they did not mean it but that they were only trying to tune up to popular opinion in the country. That is what these hon. gentlemen say whenever they meet their friends. There is no question about that. It is published in the press of this country and they have not the manliness to deny it.

Mr. SPEAKER: I think the hon. member—

Mr. CARVELL: Let him go on; there is no other man in the House who will go as far as he does.

Mr. SPEAKER: Order.

Mr. CARVELL: We know his size.

Mr. SPEAKER: Order. The hon. member will please take his seat when the Speaker rises.

Mr. CARVELL: I beg your pardon.

Mr. SPEAKER: I must ask the hon. member (Mr. W. H. Bennett) to modify his language.

Mr. CARVELL: Let him go on, we do not mind.

Mr. W. H. BENNETT: They have not the manliness to deny it.

Mr. CARVELL: He is the only man who can get up and make any kind of a statement in this House.

Mr. W. H. BENNETT: Let the political sewer-pipe from Carleton county possess his soul in patience.

Mr. SPEAKER: I think that remark ought to be taken back.

Mr. CARVELL: Let him go on. He is entirely irresponsible.

Mr. W. H. BENNETT: I will withdraw it in the House, but I will make it outside the House at the earliest opportunity. There was a meeting held in Toronto by a number of Liberals and the proceedings of that meeting were published by the Toronto Telegram of August 30.

Mr. PROULX: What is the question before the House?

Mr. W. H. BENNETT: What did the genial member for Prescott ask?

Mr. PROULX: I asked what was the question before the House.

Mr. W. H. BENNETT: The question before the House is whether or not hon. gentlemen opposite are sincere in their opposition to this Bill. If I prove by this precedent and occasion that they are not honest in other matters—I mean consistent—then they are equally dishonest here. I am going to prove, because the hon. member for Prescott was at the meeting, that in the position which they took on conscription they were inconsistent and nothing else.

Mr. McKENZIE: What does Sir Clifford Sifton say about it?

Mr. W. H. BENNETT: I presume that whatever Sir Clifford Sifton says he will stand back of, as I will stand back of what I have to say here to-night. Now let us come to this meeting. The record I am going to read from is as true as any gospel that was ever written, and not one of these gentlemen who have returned from that meeting will dare deny a word of it. The hon. member for Russell (Mr. Murphy) and the hon. member for Prescott (Mr. Proulx) were both there, and when they hear me read those statements they will not deny them. Why will they not deny them? There were thirty other men, candidates in the prov-

ince of Ontario at the present time, and these hon. gentlemen know that if they stood up and declared that the statements I am going to read are untrue they will be contradicted by the others and it becomes a question of veracity. The hon. member for Russell will not do it, because I know him too well and he is too shrewd for that. Let us take the statement of one of those gentlemen, the hon. member for Glengarry (Mr. McMillan).

> We came up here from Ottawa expecting that we might give our friends some information, but we find that instead of giving information, we have been getting it. I never was more surprised in my life than to hear what we have listened to so far this afternoon. We were given to understand that the whole province of Ontario was for conscription. Now we find that we were misled.
>
> Candidate Forester: You should have consulted us.
>
> Mr. McMillan: Yes; I admit that. I tell you frankly that if we had known some time ago what we know to-day, several of us would not have voted the way we did.

They were all voting to save their own necks and every one knows it, including the hon. member for Carleton, N.B. (Mr. Carvell). The hon. member for Moosejaw (Mr. Knowles) knows it as well as I do. Let us go on a little farther.

> We thought the people were all in favour of conscription, but, evidently, that is far from the fact. I may say that as I have a large French element in my community, and also a large body of Scotch electors, I voted for the referendum, and also for the Bill, so as to try and not offend either, but again, I say frankly, if I had known what we have heard this afternoon, my vote would have been given differently.

Three cheers for political humbug! Could you imagine that a man would stand up and have the effrontery that the hon. member for Glengarry had when he made that statement? The statement is true and no hon. gentleman opposite will deny it. Well, now, let us have another one. We heard to-night, with all the force that he is capable of putting into his utterances, from the hon. member for South Renfrew (Mr. Graham). "I stood up in this House and voted for conscription, I advocated it on principle and I will advocate it again on principle." What did the hon. member for South Renfrew say at that meeting?

> Referring to some of the criticism offered, Mr. Graham remarked that "Whom the Lord loveth he chasteneth". In explanation of his own position, Mr. Graham said he had voted and acted as he did with the knowledge and approval of his leader.

Sir, this was the game: the Laurier anti-conscription cry for Quebec and the Graham cry of conscription for Ontario, and the hon. member for South Renfrew states that deliberately, before he voted and spoke in that way, he had the thorough approval of his leader to do it. I am going to read something that will at least cause a little spirit of joy to my friend from Edmonton (Mr. Oliver). The hon. member for Edmonton has made sundry and divers remarks in the House that would tend to show that he was not altogether satisfied with the conscriptionists on that side, and I want him to know that he had the sympathy of one of the candidates, Mr. Hyslop from Huron, because Mr. Hyslop said:

> I think that the situation brought about is a most deplorable one. I do not know how they got into it, but the opinion in our part of the country is that they must have been soft-headed to allow themselves to take the attitude they did.

Where is the average elector in Ontario and in this Dominion to-day, when he sees this flim flam game being played by these gentlemen from one end of this Dominion to the other—as the hon. member for Moosejaw (Mr. Knowles) said, in the vain endeavour to save their own necks? Here is what one gentleman said:

> Win-the-war party? This is not a win-the-war party. Every gentleman says here the whole aim is to win the election. That is the policy of the party.

There was a candidate from North Essex who said:

> Like other gentlemen who have spoken, I regret the diversity of opinion that exists, and I am confused on account of it. In fact, for a month or more past I have been like Eliza in "Uncle Tom's Cabin," floating along, jumping from one cake of ice to another, and now I want to strike shore somewhere, and I want to land soon.

Not one gentleman opposite has dared to make a denial of these matters, and the reason they will not deny these statements is that there are a number of these candidates, and if they dared to make denial some of the candidates would say: For the love of Heaven, what kind of men are these men when they deny what they said in open meeting? Why are these gentlemen down upon the franchise Bill? The reason is because they find that where they expected a win on an appeal to the passion of Germans and Austrians in the Northwest, they are not going to win. I looked up the returns in the last election, and I find that in the riding of Humboldt, where the present member (Mr. Neely) had a majority of 4,218, at some of the polls there were overwhelming majorities for the Liberal candidate. I shall give some examples, placing the figures for the Liberal candidate first in each case: 46—0, 36—0, 40—2, 72—2,

21—0, 80—1, 54—0, 59—0, 58—1, 68—1, 4—1, 42—0, 62—1, 43—0, 33—0, 56—0. In sixteen polls out of 188, 811 votes were cast for Mr. Neely and only 9 votes for his opponent. In order to show you how distinctly German and foreign the names are, let me read the names of some of these polling places: Mozart, Natika, Mueller, Ponnas, Carmel, Leofeld, Forner, Florek, Galicia. "Why do the heathen rage?" That is why the hon. member for St. John (Mr. Pugsley) loses his temper; that is why, when any reference is made to any political crime that has ever been committed in the calander of the Grits, he jumps up and says: you must not refer to me. The hon. gentleman lost his temper, lost his head altogether. That is why the heathen rage, because they know that kind of vote is to be cut out. Corresponding figures and names for Mackenzie are: Clova, 47—2; Calder, 65—13, 126—8, 47—10, 30—5; Phein, 71—4 35—3, 79—1, 52—3, 60—2; Insinger, 119—22; Shebo, 119—35; Tuffnell, 83—10; Drobot, 92—5; Gourality, 80—13; Janson, 73—16; Veregin, 105—12; Canora, 113—46; Buchanan, 156—39— Deniss, 73—8; 88—13, 75—3, 62—5, 51—6. In 24 polls out of 86, Dr. Cash received 1,881 votes and his opponent 284.

The Minister of the Interior in the late Government used to go around among these people, and although he had denounced them as being such a wild and corrupt people that, as to the Galicians, the only thing you could leave in safety in their sight was a red hot kettle; times change; he became Minister of the Interior and went in among these people and said: "these are the sheep of my hand," let them all have votes. Let us come to Saltcoats. Corresponding figures for that constituency are: 64-2, 57-8, 35-8, 43-4, 28-7, 52-4, 75-4, 65-6, 53-11, 43-5, 40-2, 40-9, 30-9, 113-36, 58-19, 49-8, 36-1. In 17 polls out of 71 Mr. MacNutt received 781 votes and his opponent 143.

These hon. gentlemen know how they carried elections in that country for years, and the best proof as to the illiteracy of a number of these people is that in the records of the polls where these enormous votes were made, 120 to 0, you will never find a spoiled ballot. Why? Because, owing to their ignorance, the deputy returning officer had to mark their ballots. There is the truth of it. Were they at the Winnipeg convention? I was not there, but I will say one thing to my hon. friend, that those who were at the Toronto convention are mighty sorry they ever were there. I have this to say about the Winnipeg convention, that I think there is a spirit of uneasiness in hon. gentlemen ever since it took place. These gentlemen talk about their being a loyal party, about their being the party behind the war, the party who have been doing all they could for the country, with the approval of their leader. They have been conducting in this country for the last two years a campaign for election purposes and election purposes alone. On the 31st of March, after this House adjourned, where were to be found two of the lieutenants of this party opposite? In the far West, setting the heather afire to give their friends the idea that there was a prospect for them to win in an election. They had a meeting at Edmonton. I have an extract from that great family journal, the Edmonton Bulletin, owned by the hon. member for Edmonton, a truthful journal. Here is the report from that paper:

> E. M. Macdonald received an ovation. He devoted himself to an exposure of the mistakes and errors of the Federal Government. He said in its conduct of the war it had lost the trust of the people and that in its extravagance, its waste of public money, in its support of the profiteers and of the makers of rotten boots and rifles which were a positive source of peril to our soldiers at the front, it was no longer entitled to the respect of Canadians.

Mr. OLIVER: That is a reliable paper.

Mr. W. H. BENNETT: That is a reliable paper. Fancy the hon. gentleman from Pictou (Mr. Macdonald) denouncing the Ross rifle. The hon. gentleman from Edmonton (Mr. Oliver) says that is a truthful paper. Picture the member for Pictou standing up in this House, by the hour to champion the Ross rifle, but when he gets off in the west, in Alberta, he denounces it as an instrument that was murdering the Canadian soldiers at the front. Let us have an end to this humbug forever.

Mr. J. W. EDWARDS (Frontenac): I had not intended to take part in this debate this evening, but being, naturally, of a kindly disposition, and recognizing that hon. gentlemen opposite are in somewhat of a quandary as to who shall speak next—

Mr. D. D. McKENZIE: About twenty men on this side want to speak.

Mr. J. E. ARMSTRONG: Why do they not speak?

Mr. EDWARDS: They will get the opportunity. If there are that many members to speak, I am surprised at the lack of consideration shown by the hon. member for

North Sydney (Mr. McKenzie) in occupying so much time himself, and allowing those hon. members no opportunity to say a word. As no one rose to speak when my hon. friend sat down, I waited a reasonable time, and thought I would help them out. The hon. member from Sherbrooke (Mr. McCrea) found fault with the Prime Minister (Sir Robert Borden), because he said he had not approached the right hon. leader of the Opposition (Sir Wilfrid Laurier) in a proper spirit in regard to coalition. He said that the Prime Minister should know, that the leader of the Opposition was a man who had spent all his life in an earnest endeavour to bring all classes of race and creed in this country to a coalition of amity and perfect love. I could not help thinking, when he was making those remarks, that some of the past history of the right hon. leader of the Opposition had entirely escaped the memory of my hon. friend from Sherbrooke. I thought of some of the past political history of the country, when the leader of the Opposition, instead of being a man of peace, was going to shoulder his musket, and fight on the banks of the Saskatchewan. It did not seem to me that that was in keeping with the statement of the hon. member for Sherbrooke, that the leader of the Opposition was a man of peace, and trying to bring all classes of people together. I thought also of the time when this country, as a part of the Empire, was engaged in the terrible war, and when there was every reason why men on both sides of politics should lay aside their political differences and try and bring the people together, the right hon. leader of the Opposition brought up on the floor of this house a question which he must have known as well, or better than any other man in Canada, was bound to create dissension and discord, and that was the bilingual question—a question which he raised in Parliament, not with any intention to bring about amity and concord between the races of this country, but in my humble judgment, with the deliberate intention of consolidating his own province behind him in the next election. I also call to mind, in this connection, many utterances by the leader of the Opposition in regard to the independence of this country, in regard to England, and British connection, and British institutions, which could not have been intended to have the result, and which could not have had the result, of causing the different races of people in this country to live in greater amity and accord. Another remark made by the hon. member for Sherbrooke (Mr. McCrea) caught my attention, in regard to giving the vote to women. That did not exactly suit the hon. member for Sherbrooke. He rather took exception to the fact that some soldier overseas might have five or six relatives on this side of the water who, under this Bill, would be enabled to cast their ballot in the coming election. He mentioned the fact incidentally, not in any boastful way, of his own son being overseas, and I congratulate him on the fact that he has a son overseas, who, I dare say, is doing noble work in this great cause. He said the mother of that boy did not desire a vote, and was not worrying about votes. I can understand that the mother of that boy is thinking of the boy overseas, but it seems to me that this Bill is giving some worry to the member for Sherbrooke, (Mr. McCrea) because I cannot conceive it possible that the mother of that boy, thinking of him overseas and the danger he is going through, and knowing that he should have proper support, will cast her ballot in favour of a candidate, even though that candidate were the father of her boy, who did not want to send proper support to the men at the front. What is worrying the member for Sherbrooke, and worrying honourable members on the other side of the House is the fact that they know down in their hearts, that these women who are spending sleepless nights, their eyes filled with tears and their heart wrung with anguish because of their boys overseas, having been given the ballot will cast their votes in support of this Government, because they know they can trust this Government to keep faith with the boys at the front. That honourable gentleman took exception to the fact, as had others, on that side of the House, to some men, British subjects, who, for some years, have been living in the United States, coming over into Canada, putting on uniforms, going across the seas and fighting. They take exception to these men being given the ballot. They are British subjects, living on the other side of the line. They say they have no interest whatever in this country. But can they say truthfully of a man when he chooses to risk his life in defence of a country, that he takes no interest in that country? It is all right for these British subjects to come from another country in-

to Canada to put on the uniform and go overseas to fight for the defence of Canada, but they say it is not right for these men to fight in defence of Canada with the ballot. We on this side of the House say if they see fit to go overseas and defend Canada with their bayonet, they should also have the right to defend her with their ballot and prevent the country getting into the hands of men not in sympathy with Britain and British institutions, and with the cause of our boys overseas.

The honourable gentleman also referred to coalition. I leave it to you, Mr. Speaker, to every honourable gentlemen in the House, and every man in Canada, could any gentleman have done more than has been done by the Prime Minister of Canada, in endeavouring to secure a coalition or union government? From the beginning of the war the right honourable gentleman at the head of this Government has shown that he had before him but one object and purpose in life, and that was the winning of the war.

He has been prepared to sacrifice himself; he has shown that he has had no personal ambitions; his only aim has been the successful prosecution of this war. He made the leader of the Opposition such an offer as, I venture to say, never before was made by the leader of a government to the leader of an Opposition in any civilized country in the world. He offered him, an equal footing, a fifty-fifty basis of coalition. He did his utmost to further this proposal, but the leader of the Opposition would have nothing to do with it. Why? Because the leader of the Opposition and many hon. gentlemen on his side of the House were opposed to conscription. We have the statement of General Sir Arthur Currie, the head of our Canadian troops in Europe—a Liberal, by the way—that assistance is imperative if we are to maintain the proud position which our boys have won for us upon the fields of France and Flanders. That statement is backed up by the statement of the editor of the Globe, Stewart Lyon, the accredited correspondent of the Canadian press overseas, a man who a few months ago was opposed to conscription, but who, having seen conditions on the battlefield as they really are, has arrived at the conclusion that there is only one way to support the boys at the front and that is by adopting compulsory military service. We have further the evidence of other men, who are non-partisan, and have been impressed by the conditions at the front, and who regard conscription as the only means of giving proper support to our boys overseas. We have also, in support of the contention that conscription is the only means of giving our boys proper support, the attitude of twenty-seven Liberal members of this House, who by their votes and by their speeches have shown that in their estimation the leader of the Opposition is to bring about the passing of conscription If these gentlemen meant what they said; if their votes really meant anything they should have backed up this measure; they should have backed up the Government in every step taken to bring about the passing of conscription and to keep in power the party that will best make that Conscription Act effective. An election is pending; the issue at the election will be the question of compulsory military service. There is no other issue before the country. The question is: shall we enforce conscription and get the necessary men to support our boys at the front? The attitude taken by the leader of the Opposition is that if the people of the country should, through an election or referendum, express themselves as being in favour of conscription, then a measure of compulsory service should be adopted. But what if a referendum should have an opposite result? The men who are overseas should receive no support; that is the only conclusion that can be drawn from his argument. that is impressed upon the minds of the women of Canada, especially those who have relatives fighting in the Canadian forces overseas.

It has been said by different gentlemen on the other side that the purpose of this Bill is to win the election. If hon. gentlemen mean that, then we must conclude that they oppose this Bill because they think that by retaining on the voters' list those whom we propose to disfranchise, and by keeping off the lists the names of the wives, daughters, and sisters of soldiers, they will be enabled to win the election. Viewing the matter from that standpoint, let us suppose an election is on. The leader of the Opposition, at the head of the anti-conscription party, is reviewing those who give him their support in that election. We will suppose also that the Prime Minister, who is in favour of conscription, is reviewing before him those electors and voters who are favourable to his side of the case. Let us look at the two crowds as they pass before the leaders. In the crowd passing before the leader of the Opposi-

tion, you find the anti-British element from the province of Quebec.

The member for Sherbrooke (Mr. McCrea) may smile; but you would find that element there. I do not say that the member for Sherbrooke is anti-British, but I am telling him where he will find himself in this election. You have men in that crowd who tried to murder Lord Atholstan and to blow up his house with dynamite.

Mr. BUREAU: I rise to a point of order. The hon. gentleman has no right to say that he will find men in that crowd—pointing to the Liberal party—who tried to murder Lord Atholstan. Those people belong to the hon. gentleman's crowd.

Mr. SPEAKER: I followed carefully the remarks of the hon. member for Frontenac. He was not referring to hon. gentlemen on my left as a crowd; he was referring to those whom he considered were supporting the leader of the Opposition and he was going over a list of them.

Mr. BUREAU: We deny that they support the leader of the Opposition.

Mr. EDWARDS: We will find in that crowd—I am using the word "crowd" without offence; I do not know what other word I can use—

An hon. MEMBER: Aggregation.

Mr. EDWARDS: That is a good word. We will find in that aggregation which is passing in review before the leader of the Opposition, the hon. member for Three Rivers (Mr. Bureau).

Mr. BUREAU: And he will not be ashamed of it, either.

Mr. EDWARDS: If we judge by their actions how these men will vote, we shall find in this aggregation the soap-box orators and the dynamiters from Montreal and other parts of Quebec. We shall find in this aggregation the men who threatened to blow up the Parliament buildings and to murder the Prime Minister. We shall find also in that crowd Austrian and German reservists who failed to get out of this country in order that they might use their bayonets against our Canadian soldiers. We shall find in that aggregation the anti-British and foreign element in this country, the element who are opposed to Canada's doing her utmost in the war. You will find also the element who are opposed to Canada's keeping faith with the boys overseas. You will find in that aggregation men who in various parts of the country are tearing the Union Jack to shreds and stamping it under their feet. But you will find in the aggregation passing in review before the Prime Minister the red-blooded men of this country whose relatives are overseas, the men who are willing to back up the boys at the front. You will find by the thousands in this aggregation men who are willing to support this Government; the wives, mothers, daughters and sisters of soldiers, who will cast their votes at the polls with a view to seeing that the mantle of shame is not thrown over this country's honour through the return to power of hon. gentlemen opposite. A man is known by the company he keeps, and hon. gentlemen opposite in the election which is coming on will be in one aggregation or the other. For my part I do not want to be found in that crowd or aggregation which will be supporting and trying to put into power in this country the right hon. leader of the Opposition.

Mr. F. R. LALOR (Haldimand): At this late hour my speech will be very brief. I have had great pleasure in listening to the speeches that have been made on this side of the House this evening, and particularly to that of the Minister of Trade and Commerce (Sir George Foster). Since his eloquent explanation of the position of the Government with regard to this Bill hon. gentlemen opposite seem to have been struck dumb. It is true the hon. member for South Renfrew (Mr. Graham) attempted to make a reply, but you could see that he was very much annoyed and very disappointed to hear the true position of the Government placed before the electors in the eloquent words of the Minister of Trade and Commerce. I can tell hon. gentlemen opposite that that eloquent speech which we listened to to-night, though it lasted for no more than twenty minutes, will be heard on every platform in Canada from the Atlantic to the Pacific during this election, and if the facts as presented by the Minister of Trade and Commerce do not sway and carry the loyal and patriotic people in every constituency in this country, with the exception of the province of Quebec, I shall be very much mistaken. I believe even now the people know the facts pretty well. I think they have the leader of the Opposition and the party that supports him pretty well sized up both in Ontario and the West and the provinces down by the sea. When the election comes on and the people hear the matter fully discussed, I think hon. gentlemen opposite will be almost as dumb in this country as

they have been in this House for the last two hours. I do not know whether it is a realization of the position they occupy in the minds of the people of this country, or the forlorn hope they will lead in the next election that has struck them dumb or not, but they must be a very disappointed party, because it is not so very long ago that they wanted an election at once, because they thought they were almost sure to win. Now things have taken on a different aspect.

Mr. McKENZIE: The sooner the better. Bring it on to-morrow.

Mr. LALOR: We are going to bring it on before very long, and we hope we shall have our friend from North Cape Breton back with us, because we want some one opposite to keep the leader of the Opposition from getting lonesome.

The hon. member for South Renfrew has made some remarks about the German voters in this country, in a speech that was designed to influence, if possible, the German electors of Ontario and other provinces of the Dominion. The fact is that the measure now before the House does not change the position of the old German settlers in Canada one iota; they are in exactly the same position they always have been in, and no one knows that better than the hon. member for South Renfrew. Every one knows that no man in this country could vote unless he had taken the oath of allegiance and was enfranchised, and that is the position to-day. I represent a constituency where there are a great many Germans, and I resent any suggestion that this class of honest and respectable settlers and citizens should be disfranchised by this or any other Act of this Parliament. There is no better class of settlers in the county I represent than these fine old German settlers; there is no better class of settler in all Canada than these men who came here forty or fifty years ago. There is no part of my county I enjoy visiting more, or where I have more enthusiastic and loyal supporters than in these communities of German settlers in the county of Haldimand, and I would go down to defeat in my county rather than have these men disfranchised. I am sure it is not the intention of the Government, or the intent of this Bill, that these men should be disfranchised. I am making this statement so that the German people in my county may know that the Government have no such intention, and that any insinuations to that effect are untrue, because these settlers are in exactly the same position they have always been in as regards the franchise in this country. They are honest and law-abiding citizens, and among the best farmers in the county of Haldimand. I am on record as having made speeches in this House in defence of the German people of my county, even before the war broke out, and there is nothing that I ever said on their behalf that I propose to retract or change in the slightest degree.

Hon. gentlemen opposite are not very much in favour of extending the franchise to the female relatives of the soldiers overseas. True, they have not come out very strongly in opposition to it, but they try to becloud the issue by agitating that the franchise be extended to the women of Canada generally. I am very proud indeed to know from statements that have been made here this afternoon and from press reports that the women's organizations throughout Canada, through their presidents and vice-presidents, have told the Prime Minister of this country that they do not want the franchise at the present time, and would prefer that the female relatives of the soldiers overseas should be given that honour. It is estimated that at the next election 500,000 women will be enfranchised and vote at a federal election for the first time in the history of Canada. I am in favour of a general enfranchisement of women when the proper time comes, but this is not the time. It is a war-time election that is coming on. It was stated this afternoon, or at all events during this debate by an hon. gentleman opposite from the province of Quebec, that the women who will vote at the next election do nothing but draw pay from the Government. I do not know whether he was alluding to the wives of soldiers or not, but if there is any class of people in this country who are entitled to the franchise and will do honour to it, it is the female relatives of the soldiers who have gone overseas.

As members of Parliament instances come before us almost every day. When I heard the gentleman make that statement, I thought of one of the women in my town whose husband is unfortunately in the asylum. She depended upon a young man for her only source of livelihood—a splendid well-educated boy. He went to the front and unfortunately made the supreme sacrifice. Is that woman entitled to a vote? Would any man on this other side of the House insinuate that that woman does not do anything but stay at home and draw pay from the Government? I say it is a shame

that the man who represents a great constituency as does this gentleman should stand up in the House and make such a statement as that. It is not to his honour, nor to the honour of the Parliament of Canada. This is only one instance among many. I had a letter to-day from a Presbyterian clergyman in my town, telling me of an aged couple in the western portion of my county whose son had just made the supreme sacrifice. Surely women of this class are entitled to consideration, more than any other class of women in Canada. I believe all the women of Canada are proud of the fact, and will be proud of the fact that the franchise has been extended to those of them who are relatives of the soldiers overseas. We have instances of a good deal of division on the other side of the House, and I want to speak in all kindness with reference to it. Twenty-seven Liberals voted with us on the Conscription Bill. The hon. member for South Renfrew (Mr. Graham) said to-night that when he voted for conscription he so voted with the approval of his leader—

Mr. CARVELL: And we have received a lot of credit for it to-night, have we not?

Mr. LALOR: Those who so voted did it conscientiously, and will get credit from their electors—

Mr. CARVELL: We have not got it from the Tory party anyhow.

Mr. LALOR: Twenty-seven Liberals supported the Government on the question of conscription. I want to give them credit for it, and I think the people of Canada will give them credit for voting honestly and conscientiously; they did not do so, because they thought they would lose votes if they did not. They supported it conscientiously and honestly, because they thought it was the right thing, and that the policy of the Government should be the policy of winning the war.

Mr. MARTIN: We thought the people of Canada were against conscription, and they are against conscription, and you will see it at the next election.

Mr. LALOR: The hon. gentleman says we will se it at the next election——

Mr. MARTIN: Sure.

Mr. LALOR: We expect that in the province of Quebec the Liberals will come back to this House with the pretty strong following——

[Mr. Lalor.]

Mr. MARTIN: Not in my case. I will not run any more.

Mr. LALOR: But your representation from the other provinces of the Dominion will be mighty slim when the election is over. I want to tell the Mayor of Montreal (Mr. Martin) there is nothing which has so moved the people of Canada as the riots and the anti-conscription meetings in the province of Quebec——

Mr. MARTIN: What the hon. member says is not true; he does not read the papers.

Some hon. MEMBERS: Order, order.

Mr. MARTIN: I am trying to do everything possible——

Some hon. MEMBERS: Order, order.

Mr. SPEAKER: Order.

Mr. MARTIN: —to stop these anti-conscription meetings. The hon member does not know what he is saying——

Mr SPEAKER: If hon. gentlemen do not resume their seats when I stand I shall certainly name them. No member may interrupt the hon. member who has the floor except by that hon. member's permission.

Mr. LALOR I cast no reflection upon the Mayor of Montreal. I do not insinuate anything in reference to himself, but he is mayor of the city and he should enforce the law——

Mr. MARTIN: And he will be mayor again.

Mr. LALOR: It is his duty to enforce the law as mayor of the city. He knows whether it is being done or not, and we know of the riots about which we read in the papers every day. We know of the anti-conscription meetings which are held attended by thousands of his fellow French Canadians——

Mr. MARTIN: And English too——

Mr. LALOR: —and we have read their speeches and listened to some of their statements in this House. The Minister of Labour (Mr. Crothers) referred to one of them to-night. What is going on will help carry this election, because people will not stand for that sort of thing. The Conservatives, and the Liberals as well, throughout the Dominion of Canada, are loyal people, with good red blood in their veins. They have sent their sons and their husbands overseas to fight our fight, and to do honour and credit to the Empire and to the Dominion as well, and they have done credit to it. They do not like to hear of the condition

of affairs in the province of Quebec, and of the small number of enlistments there. I was speaking of the men on the other side of the House—

Mr. SPEAKER: I must ask the hon. member not to refer to hon members as "men on the other side of the House". It is not parliamentary.

Mr. LALOR: I want to say to the members on the other side of the House who have supported conscription, and have stood by it honestly and constantly, that they deserve the credit of this House, of their constituencies, and of the country, and I believe they will get it without any question of doubt. There is just one other matter to which I wish to refer, and that is, union government. I have always been in favour of union government. I believe that the great problems we have, not only of sending men overseas, but the financial problems, the problem of our returning soldiers, and many other great problems in this country, are such that we should have had a union government in Canada. I believe the Prime Minister has made every honest effort to bring about such a government. He has offered the Opposition fifty-fifty—one-half of the portfolios. That offer has been refused. I am sorry indeed, as a member of this House, and as a good Canadian, that we have not had a union government in Canada. However, the offer has been refused, and now I presume it will be a party election, which is most unfortunate. I regret that we must have an election at all. I am sorry hon. gentlemen opposite did not see their way clear to extend the life of Parliament until after the war, thus avoiding all the turmoil an election will bring about, and all the feeling that will be aroused by that election.

The amendment of Mr. Neely was negatived on the following division:

YEAS.

Messieurs:

Barrette,	Lapointe (Kamouraska),
Boivin,	Lapointe Montreal, St. James),
Bourassa,	Macdonald,
Boyer,	Maclean (Halifax),
Brouillard,	McKenzie,
Bureau,	Marcile (Bagot),
Delisle,	Martin,
Demers,	Michaud,
Devlin,	Mondou,
Fortier,	Neely,
Gauthier (St. Hyacinthe),	Oliver,
Gauvreau,	Pacaud,
Kay,	Papineau,
Kyte,	Pugsley,
Lachance,	Turriff,
Lafortune,	Verville.—33.
Lanctot,	

NAYS.

Messieurs:

Armstrong (Lambton),	McLean (Sunbury),
Armstrong (York, O.),	Marshall,
Bennett (Simcoe),	Meighen,
Blondin,	Merner,
Boys,	Morphy,
Brabazon,	Morris,
Bristol,	Munson,
Champagne,	Nicholson,
Clark (Bruce),	Nickle,
Clarke (Wellington),	Paul,
Cochrane,	Reid,
Currie,	Roche,
Donaldson,	Rogers,
Edwards,	Schaffner,
Elliot,	Sexsmith,
Foster (Sir George),	Shepherd,
Fripp,	Steele,
Glass,	Stevens,
Guthrie,	Stewart (Lunenburg),
Hanna,	Sutherland,
Hazen,	Taylor,
Hughes (Sir Sam),	Thompson (Yukon),
Jameson,	Wallace,
Lalor,	Webster,
Lewis,	Weichel,
McCurdy,	Wright.—53.
McLean (Queens, P.E.I.),	

PAIRS.

(List of Pairs supplied by Chief Whips.)

Messieurs:

Ministerial.	Opposition.
Arthurs,	Truax,
Ames (Sir Herbert),	Nesbitt,
Alguire,	McMillan,
Ball,	Turgeon,
Burnham,	Murphy,
Barnard,	Achim,
Bowman,	Proulx,
Bennett, R. B.,	Hughes, J. J.,
Borden, Sir Robert,	Laurier, Sir Wilfrid,
Best,	Ross,
Bradbury,	Cruise,
Burrell,	Douglas,
Boyce,	McCraney,
Carrick,	Power,
Chabot,	Beland,
Clements,	Knowles,
Cockshutt,	Charlton,
Cromwell,	Tobin,
Crothers,	McCoig,
Davidson,	Carroll,
Doherty,	Marcil (Bonaventure),
Green,	Buchanan,
Henderson,	Sinclair,
Kemp, Sir Edward,	Robb,
McLeod,	Carvell,
Middlebro,	Pardee,
Morrison,	Molloy,
McLean, W. F.,	Cardin,
Northrup,	German,
Rainville,	Seguin,
Robidoux,	Copp,
Sevigny,	Lemieux,
Stanfield,	Macdonald,
Smith,	Neely,
Scott,	Ethier,
Stewart (Hamilton),	Loggie,
Thoburn,	McCrea,
Tremain,	Chisholm,
Walker,	Bickerdike,
White, Sir Thomas,	Graham,
Wilson (Wentworth).	Wilson (Laval).

The motion of Sir Robert Borden for the third reading of the Bill was agreed to on the following division:

YEAS.

Messieurs:

Armstrong (Lambton), McLean (Sunbury),
Armstrong (York, O.), Marshall,
Bennett (Simcoe), Meighen,
Blondin, Merner,
Boys, Morphy,
Brabazon, Morris,
Bristol, Munson,
Champagne, Nicholson,
Clark (Bruce), Nickle,
Clarke (Wellington), Paul,
Cochrane, Reid,
Currie, Roche,
Donaldson, Rogers,
Edwards, Schaffner,
Elliot, Sexsmith,
Foster (Sir George), Shepherd,
Fripp, Steele,
Glass, Stevens,
Guthrie, Stewart (Lunenburg),
Hanna, Sutherland,
Hazen, Taylor,
Hughes (Sir Sam), Thompson (Yukon),
Jameson, Wallace,
Lalor, Webster,
Lewis, Weichel,
McCurdy, Wright.—53.
McLean (Queens, P.E.I.),

NAYS.

Messieurs:

Barrette, Lapointe (Kamouraska),
Boivin, Lapointe (Montreal, St. James),
Bourassa, Macdonald,
Boyer, Maclean (Halifax),
Brouillard, McKenzie,
Bureau, Marcile (Bagot),
Delisle, Martin,
Demers, Michaud,
Devlin, Mondou,
Fortier, Oliver,
Gauthier (St. Hyacinthe), Pacaud,
Gauvreau, Papineau,
Kay, Pugsley,
Kyte, Turriff,
Lachance, Verville.—32.
Lafortune,
Lanctot,

PAIRS.

(List of Pairs supplied by Chief Whips.)

Messieurs:

Ministerial.	Opposition.
Arthurs,	Truax,
Ames (Sir Herbert),	Nesbitt,
Alguire,	McMillan,
Ball,	Turgeon,
Burnham,	Murphy,
Barnard,	Achim,
Bowman,	Proulx,
Bennett, R. B.,	Hughes, J. J.,
Borden, Sir Robert,	Laurier, Sir Wilfrid,
Best,	Ross,
Bradbury,	Cruise,
Burrell,	Douglas,
Boyce,	McCraney,
Carrick,	Power,
Chabot,	Beland,
Clements,	Knowles,
Cockshutt,	Charlton,
Cromwell,	Tobin,
Crothers,	McCoig,
Davidson,	Carroll,
Doherty,	Marcil (Bonaventure),
Green,	Buchanan,
Henderson,	Sinclair,
Kemp, Sir Edward,	Robb,
McLeod,	Carvell,
Middlebro,	Pardee,
Morrison,	Molloy,
McLean, W. F.,	Cardin,
Northrup,	German,
Rainville,	Seguin,
Robidoux,	Copp,
Sevigny,	Lemieux,
Stanfield,	Macdonald,
Smith,	Neely,
Scott,	Ethier,
Stewart (Hamilton),	Loggie,
Thoburn,	McCrea,
Tremain,	Chisholm,
Walker,	Bickerdike,
White, Sir Thomas,	Graham,
Wilson (Wentworth).	Wilson (Laval).

Mr. SINCLAIR: I was paired with the hon. member for Halton (Mr. Henderson). Otherwise I would have voted for the amendment and against the Bill.

Mr. PROULX: I was paired with the hon. member for East Huron (Mr. Bowman). Otherwise I would have voted for the amendment and against the Bill.

Motion agreed to, and Bill read the third time and passed.

On motion of Sir George Foster, the House adjourned at 2.30 a.m. Saturday.

Saturday, September 15, 1917.

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

ORDER IN COUNCIL—ENEMY NATIONALITY.

Copy of an Order in Council approved September 13th, with regard to conditions under which naturalization may be granted to persons who have resided for a long time in this country, although of enemy nationality.—Sir Robert Borden.

FIRST READING OF SENATE BILL.

Bill No. 132, to amend The Companies Act.—Mr. Meighen.

TRIBUNALS UNDER MILITARY SERVICE ACT, 1917.

On the Orders of the Day:

Sir WILFRID LAURIER: I regret having to again ask the Government to lay on the Table the list of tribunals to be appointed under the Military Service Act.

Hon. C. J. DOHERTY (Minister of Justice): The proclamation establishing the tribunals was officially published in the Canada Gazette of September 12th, and I am producing a copy of the Gazette.

Sir SAM HUGHES: May I ask if copies will be placed in our postoffice boxes?

Hon. Mr. DOHERTY: I am laying it on the Table now.

Sir ROBERT BORDEN: I think the Official Gazette goes to each member of Parliament.

Sir SAM HUGHES: I understand so, but we never see it. It comes as a newspaper, and is usually thrown in the waste basket.

Sir ROBERT BORDEN: I am afraid we cannot force hon. gentlemen to read it.

Hon. Mr. MURPHY: May I ask if this list is subject to amendment, or correction, or increase?

Hon. Mr. DOHERTY: Yes. If conditions should make it necessary it would have to be done. There is a provision in the statute to the effect that it may be done from time to time.

Mr. GRAHAM: The difficulty about the Gazette going to members is that it goes to our home address, and we are in Ottawa.

Sir GEORGE FOSTER: You are expected to be at home by this time.

Mr. GRAHAM: But the fault is not ours. We have had business here.

Mr. DOHERTY: I will see if I can arrange to have special copies sent to hon. members.

Sir WILFRID LAURIER: According to what has been published in the newspapers, there seems to be a serious deficiency in the establishment of these tribunals. For instance, it would appear that there were to be 165 tribunals established in the city of Montreal, but there is no indication as to their exact location. It would be somewhat different in the rural districts, for instance in the county of Montmorency, tribunals would be established at St. Anne de Beaupré, Chateau Richer, and so on. I presume this detail has not been looked into.

Mr. DOHERTY: In Montreal and, I think, the larger cities, the intention was that the particular location should be determined by the Registrar, after making inquiry to see what would best suit the convenience of everybody. It is not as easy to fix particular locations in a city as it would be in villages and towns. The intention was that the Registrar should make arrangements for suitable places, and then we would give special notice as to the exact locations.

Mr. GRAHAM: Will it be possible to have any corrections made? A gentleman called upon me last night and pointed out that he thought there was not a sufficient number of tribunals in his riding, as the distances were very great. I sent his suggestion to the Prime Minister this morning, but I should have sent it to the Minister of Justice.

Mr. DOHERTY: I have already stated in answer to the hon. member for Russell (Mr. Murphy) that if conditions show additional tribunals are required they will be provided. This can be done under the statute.

Mr. BUREAU: Might I ask the minister if the population has been taken into account in the establishment of these tribunals, and if so, how many thousands of population has been determined upon as being entitled to a tribunal?

Mr. DOHERTY: If my memory serves me correctly, it was estimated that there should be, generally speaking, a tribunal for about 7,500 of population. Of course, in the larger cities it would not be necessary to have as many as that would represent, because of the greater density of population and the greater facility with which people could reach the places established. I understand it was estimated that for every 7,500 of population the largest number of men who would be liable to this call would be about 500. Every one, I presume, will not ask for exemption and 500 ought to be the maximum of the possible cases which one tribunal would be called upon to deal with.

Sir SAM HUGHES: I understood that a tribunal, if they had a large population or area, could meet in one part of the tribunal area and then move to another without any higher authority intervening?

Mr. DOHERTY: They will have authority to move from one part to another where there is a sufficient gathering of people at different parts and where such movement will more effectually meet the general convenience.

Sir SAM HUGHES: That is, within their own area?

Mr. GAUVREAU: Will that only be in the large cities or will it apply to the rural districts also? In Temiscouata there are five tribunals and they are quite distant from each other. Could one of these tribunals proceed to another place and sit there at any time it liked?

Mr. DOHERTY: Yes, any of the tribunals will be authorized to move from place to place when the exigencies require it. The purpose is to settle the location which shall be the headquarters of the tribunal.

Mr. BUREAU: The minister says that it is supposed that no more than 500, out of 7,500, will make an application and that in the cities, the population being denser, they will not have to go far to get to a tribunal. It is not only the question of how far they will have to travel to get to the tribunal that I am interested in for there is also the question of the time taken to hear the applications. The question raised by my hon. friend from Temiscouata is a proper one. Take cities such as Hull, Sherbrooke, Three Rivers, Shawinigan or Grand'Mere, which have a population of from 22,000 to 23,000. It would not be so much the inconvenience of getting there as it would be the question of the time that the people would require to take to submit their evidence and have their applications settled. How many tribunals are there in Three Rivers which has a population of 22,000? There are a great many people working in the mills. We have the munition factories, paper mills and various other industries. There should be quite a number of applications. I do not think one tribunal of the kind mentioned in the proclamation will be sufficient. I do not think proper time will be afforded to give due consideration to all the applications. My demand for information is not so much as to the distance to be covered by each one who desires to go before the tribunal as it is to the time which it will take to enable the people to make their applications and to have them properly considered.

Mr. DOHERTY: There is no finality about this list. Tribunals may be established from time to time and after the tribunals have proceeded to their operations, if there is reason to believe that there is need for further tribunals, they will be provided. I was under the impression that there was more than one tribunal provided for Three Rivers but I do not speak with any certainty. My own impression would be that more than one tribunal would be required but I will make inquiry. These things have not been dealt with personally by me but the hon. member can feel quite satisfied that a sufficient number will be provided.

Mr. PUGSLEY: I notice that in St. John county the parish of St. Martin's has been omitted altogether. Perhaps the minister will take notice of it? I think the Minister of Marine (Mr. Hazen) will agree that there should be a tribunal in St. Martin's. There is one in the parish of Simond's but St. Martin's is a very important section of the county.

Mr. HAZEN: They thought maybe, that one tribunal would be sufficient for the two parishes of St. Martin's and Simond's. I would be disposed to believe that the parish of St. Martin's being the more distant there should be a further tribunal for that parish. It might suit the convenience of the people of Simond's to come into the city because they all come in to do their business. However, I think the matter ought to be looked into.

Mr. MURPHY: There has been an intimation in the newspapers that a scale of fees has been determined for the members of the local tribunals. Is that correct?

Mr. DOHERTY: The matter has not been absolutely settled but I will be able to give the hon. gentleman a positive answer on Monday.

Sir SAM HUGHES: They are not fees, are they?

Mr. DOHERTY: It is a question of remuneration of some description.

PRIVILEGE.

Statement by Mr. Boivin denying imputations.

On the Orders of the Day:

Mr. G. H. BOIVIN (Shefford): Mr. Speaker, I rise to a question of privilege. In his remarks last evening the hon. member for Kingston (Mr. Nickle) is reported in Hansard to have spoken as follows:

> I was surprised the other night to listen to the speech of the hon. gentleman from Shefford (Mr. Boivin), who seemed to treat with scorn the sacrifices which the relatives of the soldiers had made in this war. He said they stayed at home and drew separation allowances from the Patriotic Fund. He must have come from a district where men have not gone overseas in large numbers.

The hon. member for Haldimand (Mr. Lalor) also used somewhat similar language. I would ask these hon. gentlemen to read my remarks in Hansard of Monday last,

and they will be convinced that I did not treat with scorn the sacrifices made by the relatives of soldiers. In my remarks I was making a comparison between the sacrifice made by some soldier's wives and the other women of Canada, who, since the beginning of the war, have given of their time, energy, and means to the cause of the soldiers, but who have had no sons to offer to the cause. I realize as well as any hon. member of this House, with the probable exception of those who have sons of their own at the front, the enormous sacrifice which mothers and sisters must make to see their loved ones take up arms in defence of the Empire. I resent such interpretation being put upon my remarks, and such imputation being cast upon me, that I would ever think of treating with scorn the sacrifices made by the relatives of soldiers.

WAR TAX UPON INCOMES.

RULING BY MR. SPEAKER ON THE RIGHT OF THE SENATE TO AMEND A MONEY BILL—AMENDMENTS MADE BY THE SENATE CONCURRED IN.

On the Order:

Resuming adjourned debate on the proposed motion of Sir Thomas White for the concurrence in amendments made by the Senate to Bill No. 117, an Act to authorize the levying of a War Tax upon certain incomes, (resumed from Friday, September 7).

Mr. SPEAKER: On a previous occasion when this motion was under consideration, two points of order were taken by the right hon. the leader of the Opposition, (1) that the Senate has no power to amend a money Bill, and, (2) if the Senate makes such an amendment, in view of rule 78, the House is bound to insist on its privileges and reject the amendment.

As to the first point, it is beyond question that, in view of section 53 of the British North America Act, Bills appropriating any part of the public revenue or for imposing any tax or impost must originate in the House of Commons; and there is no doubt that the Senate has neither power to increase the tax or impost nor to change the incidence of the burden of any such tax or impost in any such Bill originating in this House; but the question whether the Senate can make such amendments as have been made in the Bill now under consideration is a point of constitutional law in respect to which it would I think be improper for me to undertake to give an official decision. Matters of such high constitutional import are for the House and not for your Speaker to determine.

With respect to the second point, viz., that Rule 78 prevents the House from entertaining the present motion, while this rule is an affirmation of what this House considers its powers and prerogatives, there is nothing contained in it or any of our rules which prevents this House from adopting as its own, amendments such as this now under consideration. In the year 1874, amendments of the Senate to a Bill originating in this House were concurred in with the reservation that such action was not to be construed as a waiver of its rules and privileges. While the action of this House in the year 1874 was with respect to a Bill dealing with Dominion Lands, and the present Bills deals with taxation, in my judgment the principle involved as to the authority of this House to waive under stated conditions its rights and privileges is the same.

I need only say with respect to Rule 87 that it has no bearing upon or application to the present case.

After careful consideration, I am of the opinion that the motion of the Minister of Finance is in order, but should it be accepted by this House I shall give directions to the clerk to make a special entry in the Journals of the House to the effect that this House, while disapproving of any infraction of its privileges or rights by the other House, in this case waives its claims to insist upon such rights and privileges, but that the waiver of the said rights and privileges in this case is not to be drawn into a precedent.

Sir WILFRID LAURIER: I have nothing to say as to your ruling, Sir, but I would suggest that, instead of the caveat proceeding from the Chair, it should be part of the motion itself.

Mr. SPEAKER: With respect to the point raised by the right hon. member, there is no objection, so far as I am concerned. I may say that I am guided in taking the action I have taken by similar action on the part of the Speaker of the British House of Commons in respect to an analogous case some ten years ago.

Mr. MURPHY: Does the precedent to which Your Honour has just referred also extend to the entry which you purpose to have made in the Journals of the House, as emanating from the Speaker rather than from the House?

Mr. SPEAKER: I have used the exact language of the Speaker of the British House

of Commons, except that I have added a line taken from the entry made in the journals of this House in 1874.

Mr. MACDONALD: I desire to call the attention of the House to what I think is an important change made by the Senate in this Bill, and which provides that a hearing by the board in regard to the question of the amount of tax to be assessed should be held in camera at the request of the taxpayer. The discussion upon the wisdom of accepting that amendment was cut off by the consideration of the point of order which the Speaker has just decided. It is true that there may be cases in which it would be desirable that that should be done, but I do not think it should be open to every person who may be subject to income tax to insist upon a hearing in camera. It is left to the taxpayer to insist upon a private hearing of the proceedings before the board or Exchequer Court. In the ordinary courts, in cases in which it is desirable that the proceedings should be held in private—and the law permits that in some criminal cases of very serious import—the matter is left in the discretion of the court. Here the person taxed has full discretion, no matter what the tribunal may think. It is questionable if it is not desirable to have these proceedings in public, so that the public, who are contributing to the taxes, may know what grounds are raised by parties as reasons for being exempted from this taxation. Very peculiar circumstances might arise under such a provision. No one will want to have his assessment considered in public if he can have a private hearing by simply asking for it. The result will be that all proceedings will be held in secrecy, and the country will not know, this House will not know, no one will be able to tell, except the gentlemen composing the tribunal and the parties to the case, on what principle the thing has been decided.

It does seem to me, therefore, that this is not a wise measure, and that some discretion should be left with the tribunal and the court to determine whether or not the rule as to the trying of the case in public should be departed from in this particular instance. We are practically legislating here that the proceedings before a tribunal, in order to ascertain what the assessment of any man should be under the income tax measure, shall be held in private. I do not think that is wise legislation, and I think the House ought to hesitate before declaring that all these proceedings shall be held in private.

[The Speaker.]

Sir ROBERT BORDEN: I should have preferred that this amendment had not been made by the Senate. However, as far as I can ascertain by inquiry, there is not much probability of their receding from it. There is some force in the observations which my hon. friend has put forward. On the other hand, it can hardly be supposed that a board of referees composed of responsible and reputable men would be likely to adopt one principle in one case and another principle in another case. Certainly that would not be urged for one moment with regard to the Exchequer Court of Canada. The House may therefore reasonably conclude that there will be an application of the same principle to all cases. The view of the Senate is doubtless based on the consideration that it might be very detrimental to the interest of the taxpayer, not in all cases but in certain cases, if publicity were given to his business affairs to the extent that would be necessary if the proceedings were held in public. It is not desirable that an inquisitorial proceeding of this kind should be conducted in such a way as to be attended with detriment to any man's business. The object of the Bill is to procure a fair assessment, and we have, as a guarantee that this will be done, an investigation by the Board of Referees in the first instance. Then the Crown has the opportunity of an appeal to the Exchequer Court of Canada if it should appear that the determination of the Board of Referees is not in the public interest.

Mr. NESBITT: Is it only in case of dispute, or in all cases, that the matter is referred to the Board of Referees?

Sir ROBERT BORDEN: The Board of Referees is appointed for the purpose of determining the assessment, and there is an appeal to the Exchequer Court.

Mr. F. B. CARVELL (Carleton): My view is very much the same as that of my hon. friend from Pictou (Mr. Macdonald), and perhaps I have other reasons, which I should like to give to the House. We all know that it is a matter of history that the rich man never pays his fair share of taxation, as compared with the poor man; I do not care whether it is income taxation, or ordinary taxation by a municipality. The man who owns a small home or a little piece of property is obliged to pay taxes upon it. The assessor can see his property and it is assessed for at least as much as

it is worth, compared with the assessment of other property. But the difficulty about the rich man is that his property is not visible, the assessor cannot see it, and is compelled to take the man's word as to what his income is. I think cases of this kind which occur in connection with municipal taxation illustrate what is likely to take place in connection with the income tax. We know that there are many people in every municipality in Canada who deliberately and persistently keep their taxation away below what it ought to be by not furnishing proper returns to the assessor. I am not casting aspersions on anybody, but am speaking generally. There is no doubt that the rich man will be just as anxious to pay as little taxation under this measure as under any scheme of municipal taxation, and if you allow these investigations to be held in camera the public will never know what is taking place. I realize there may be cases where people might pry into the private affairs of some individual, but that is one of the misfortunes incident to the case. A man with an income of $25,000 or $50,000 a year may declare in his statement that his income is $10,000, and his statement goes, because no publicity is given to it, and the average man who would be interested in seeing that this man paid his fair share of taxation is not given an opportunity of being present to find out just what he is paying. Later on, you may possibly get a return from Parliament showing what the taxation was, but if the same policy is adopted by the Government in regard to the income tax as was adopted with regard to the Business Profits War Tax, not only will the public have no opportunity of knowing what is taking place when the taxation is imposed, but they will not know later on what taxation any particular man pays. I have persistently tried this session to find out what taxes have been paid under the Business Profits Tax, and how certain firms and corporations had made their profits, but the Finance Minister has deliberately refused to bring down this information except upon an order of the House. If I want to get this information I can go to his office, he says, and they will give it to me as a member of Parliament. When I asked him if that meant that I could give the information to my constituents I got a very curt answer, implying that if I did that I should be violating his confidence. I could not accept information of that character, so I gave him a list of four or five firms, all of whom have been doing business in my province, but none of which has paid the Business Profits War Tax. If I went to the minister's office I presume I could get the information I desire, but in such a way that he would consider I had violated his confidence if I made the information public. Therefore I did not act on his suggestion, and I and my constituents do not know to-day whether these people have paid anything or not.

If a similar policy were adopted by the Government in respect of the income tax, neither the people of the community nor the representative of those people in Parliament would be able to find out what is going on. I feel very strongly on this question of income tax; it is one of the few policies of the Government with which I am heartily in accord. I have been preaching income tax since August, 1914; at every session of Parliament I have advocated it, and I am glad indeed that the Government have acceded to the popular demand by introducing this Bill—though it is not anything like as comprehensive as I would like to see it. I am so glad, however, to see the principle established that I am willing to accept whatever hon. gentlemen have brought down, in the hope that later on a large proportion of our revenue will be raised by this direct method of taxation. We cannot shut our eyes to the fact that the financial condition of Canada has so changed during the last three years as to revolutionize our whole method of taxation. The time has gone by when we can continue to raise money by means of customs and excise or other indirect methods of taxation. We have to get down to direct taxation, and to adopt a system so efficient, straight and above board that every man will know whether or not his neighbour is paying his fair share of taxation. The moment you allow these assessments or appeals to take place in camera, you take away from the people the right of compelling the rich man to contribute his fair share of taxation. This is one of the most important questions that has come before Parliament this session. I think that the House should disagree with the proposed amendment, even to the extent of demanding a conference with the Senate. I am sure that if the matter were put before them; if they were shown the tremendous importance of this matter to the people, they would be willing to give it reasonable consideration. If this amendment is adopted, many people will not pay their fair share and many will pay nothing at all.

Mr. NESBITT: They have to go before the tribunals. Will the tribunals pass them?

Mr. CARVELL: The tribunals will not know who they are; the tribunals have no discretion in the matter. Take my own case. I believe that under the Act I should be called upon to submit to some sort of statement to the board of tribunals. None of my neighbours know what statement I have submitted; that is all kept quiet. The tribunal will not bother itself very much about it unless some one takes an interest in the matter, and nobody can take an interest in it, because nobody can be present at the hearing. The result is that I get through with the statement that I submitted to the tribunal. If the statement is an honest one, well and good; if it is a dishonest one, there is no check upon me. And suppose I submitted no statement at all? For the reasons that I have given, I strongly object to the amendment proposed by the Senate.

Mr. A. K. MACLEAN (Halifax): If it was in the mind of the Senate to prevent the disclosure of private affairs, I do not think that their amendment accomplishes that object. There could hardly be any disclosure of private or personal affairs at the hearing of an appeal by the Exchequer Court; the appeal would, of necessity, be on a question of principle. I cannot conceive of an appeal to the Exchequer Court having reference to anything else than the question whether the taxpayer was liable under a certain section of the Act or upon a certain portion of his income. The taxpayer must, in the first instance, fill out the necessary form. If the board are of opinion that additional information is desirable, they can compel him to furnish that additional information or to make a further return; and the board may require the production upon oath by the taxpayer of any information in reference to his income. In that case there might be a disclosure of private affairs, but that would very seldom happen. In view of the fact that persons would seldom be required to make a disclosure of personal affairs which would be undesirable or objectionable, it is a pity to establish any in camera proceedings in connection with the administration of this Act. It sounds peculiar to say that there should be an appeal to the Exchequer Court in camera. I do not think that we should permit the adoption of the principle; I do not think that any taxpayer would ask for it. Any matters coming before the board either as a review board or as an assessment board, or before the Exchequer Court, would in very few cases require objectionable disclosures of private affairs. A dispute might arise as to the interpretation of a section or clause of the Act, or whether the income from some foreign investment was liable to taxation. The appeals and reviews will largely relate to matters of principle, not to matters of detail; no taxpayer will object to that. I agree with the member for Carleton (Mr. Carvell) that we should insist upon adherence to the Act as it left this House, and that we ask for a conference with the Senate on the question.

Mr. BUREAU: Mr. Speaker, I do not see that the argument that private business of any kind would be disclosed is very strong in this case. If a man were compelled to disclose some process or secret in connection with the production or preparation of a certain commodity, that would be objectionable. But in this case a man goes before the court; he says he has an income of $10,000. If he is carrying on an honest business, I do not think that he should be ashamed to disclose how he is getting his money. On the other hand, people who get incomes which are not exactly legitimate might be induced to stop carrying on business the nature of which they are afraid to disclose to the public. The principle of having these things carried on behind closed doors is wrong. I simply desire to put myself on record as being absolutely opposed to having these appeals or investigations as to income held behind closed doors.

Mr. SPEAKER: Is it the pleasure of the House that the motion be adopted?

Some hon. MEMBERS: Carried.

Some hon. MEMBERS: Lost.

Mr. CARVELL: If there is no agreement, I want a vote taken.

Sir WILFRID LAURIER: There is no agreement.

The motion of Sir Thomas White for concurrence by the House in the amendments made by the Senate was agreed to on the following division:

YEAS.

Messieurs:

Armstrong (Lambton),	Merner,
Bennett (Simcoe),	Morphy,
Borden (Sir Robert),	Morris,
Boys,	Rainville,
Bristol,	Roche,

Clark (Bruce),	Rogers,
Clarke (Wellington),	Schaffner,
Cochrane,	Sexsmith,
Elliot,	Shepherd,
Foster (Sir George),	Steele,
Fripp,	Stevens,
Glass,	Stewart (Lunenburg),
Henderson,	Sutherland,
Hughes (Sir Sam),	Taylor,
Jameson,	Wallace,
Lewis,	Weichel,
Marshall,	Wright.—34.

NAYS.

Messieurs:

Boivin,	Macdonald,
Bureau,	McKenzie,
Kyte,	Marcile (Bagot),
Lapointe (Kamouraska),	Michaud,
Laurier (Sir Wilfrid),	Murphy,
	Oliver.—11.

PAIRS.

(List of Pairs supplied by Chief Whips.)

Messieurs:

Ministerial.	Opposition.
Alguire,	McMillan,
Ames, Sir Herbert,	Nesbitt,
Ball,	Turgeon,
Barnard,	Achim,
Bowman,	Proulx,
Best,	Ross,
Bennett, R. B.,	Hughes, J.J.,
Boyce,	Martin,
Bradbury,	Cruise,
Burrell,	Douglas,
Carrick,	Power,
Chabot,	Beland,
Clements,	Knowles,
Cockshutt,	Charlton,
Cromwell,	Tobin,
Crothers,	McCoig,
Donaldson,	Devlin,
Davidson,	Carroll,
Doherty,	Marcil (Bonaventure),
Green,	Buchanan,
Hazen,	Pugsley,
Kemp, Sir Edward,	Robb,
McLeod,	Carvell,
McLean, W. F.,	Cardin,
Middlebro,	Pardee,
Marshall,	Neely,
Morrison,	Molloy,
Nickle,	Kay,
Northrup,	German,
Robidoux,	Copp,
Rainville,	Seguin,
Sevigny,	Lemieux,
Stanfield,	Macdonald,
Scott,	Ethier,
Stewart, T. J.,	Loggie,
Thompson (Yukon),	Sinclair,
Thoburn,	McCrea,
Tremain,	Chisholm,
Walker,	Bickerdike,
White, Sir Thomas,	Graham,
Webster,	Gauvreau,
Wilson.	Wilson.

INSPECTION AND SALE ACT.

MARKING OF PACKAGES CONTAINING HUMAN FOOD AND OTHER COMMODITIES.

Sir GEORGE FOSTER (Minister of Trade and Commerce) moved the second reading of Bill No. 120, to amend the Inspection and Sale Act. He said:

I called this order for the purpose of having it discharged from the Order Paper. I wish to make a statement as to why that is done. I had not any very strong idea that the measure could be perfected and placed on the statute books at this session. My primary idea was to introduce it, have a discussion upon it, and then distribute it widely. That idea will be carried out. As hon. gentlemen will remember, it deals with marking the contents of packages and containers. While there is a very general, and in fact I might say almost complete, adhesion to the principle, it works out in different ways in different industries, and different wholesale and retail operations, so that it requires a good deal

4 p.m. of investigation and technical information—using "technical" in the sense of the information which is in possession of those who are actually carrying on the operations. The Bill is being widely distributed, and the different interests are asked to send in their recommendations and comments with reference to it. After the election is over and we are back again in this House I hope to introduce a very perfect Bill. I move, therefore, that the order be discharged.

Mr. GRAHAM: Can a private member introduce a Bill of this kind?

Sir GEORGE FOSTER: He might introduce it.

Motion agreed to, and order discharged.

THE DRY DOCK SUBSIDIES ACT, 1910, AMENDMENT.

SECOND READING OF BILL.

Hon. J. D. HAZEN (Minister of Marine and Fisheries) moved the second reading of Bill No. 134, An Act to Amend the Dry Dock Subsidies Act, 1910.

Mr. CARVELL: Will the hon. minister please explain?

Mr. HAZEN: The Bill was explained to the House by the Acting Minister of Public Works when it was introduced and received its first reading, a few days ago. I am sorry my hon. friend from St. John (Mr. Pugsley) is not in his place, as I believe he has made a special study of the measure. He stated on that occasion that he thought it was a measure which was entirely in the public interest. The changes contemplated by this Bill are not very numerous. The principal changes are made for the purpose of making financing

easier for those gentlemen who are willing to engage in the construction of dry docks. It is claimed by many who have looked into the matter and who are willing to erect dry docks in different parts of the country where they are needed, that under existing circumstances it is impossible for them to make the necessary financial arrangements to carry out the work. The interest allowed at the present time by way of subsidy upon the money which is put into those dry docks is four per cent per year for a period of thirty-five years. It is proposed to make the interest four and one-half per cent a year for the same period, and further, that that interest may be paid half-yearly instead of yearly, as is now the case. The section would read:

(a) if of the first class, a sum not exceeding four and one-half per cent of the cost of the work as fixed and determined under subsection two of this section, half yearly during a period not exceeding thirty-five years from the time the Governor in Council has determined under this Act that the work has been completed.

Then there is a new paragraph added, which provides that no securities can be issued against the subsidy until it has been established to the satisfaction of the minister that not less than $1,000,000 has been spent on the work, and the material upon or for such dock. Under the original statute, when $1,000,000 worth of work and material had been provided, the minister might allow the issue of securities up to seventy-five per cent of the work actually done and material delivered on the site shown to be free from actual incumbrance. It also provides that the payment of the subsidy may begin when the work done and the materials provided amount to $1,000,000. At present the payment of the subsidy cannot be made until the dock is actually completed. In other words, they do not commence to get any aid under the present Subsidy Act until the dock is actually completed and ready for operation.

Mr. CARVELL: Assuming that the $1,000,000 has been expended and authority has been granted for the paying of the interest on a certain specified amount—

Mr. HAZEN: That is the subsidy.

Mr. CARVELL: —then, supposing the work was not proceeded with—would the department still continue to pay that subsidy, or would the whole thing lapse until the dock was finished?

Mr. HAZEN: The Government would have to take its chance, of course, with regard to that. If the work ceases, the Government would not have to pay the subsidy, but it would have already made certain payments. If people were constructing a dry dock and had spent $1,000,000 in work and materials, the payments of the subsidy would begin when that $1,000,000 had been spent.

Mr. CARVELL: And would continue even if the work ceased?

Mr. HAZEN: If they had put $1,000,000 into the work, it is a pretty fair indication that it would be proceeded with and finished.

Mr. PUGSLEY: And the subsidy would be allowed if the minister was satisfied that all claims were to be paid?

Mr. HAZEN: Of course the minister would have to be satisfied that all claims were paid before any bonds were issued. This clause makes the payment of a partial subsidy absolute, whether the dock is completed or not. There are two other changes of a minor nature in the first part of the Act. One provides that the width of the docks shall be increased from 110 feet to 125 feet, and the other provides that the depth of the docks shall be increased, so that the water over the sill shall be 38 feet, not 37 feet as under the present Act. These changes are made in accordance with the representations of the Admiralty, and are rendered necessary because of the larger size of the vessels which are being built to-day.

The DEPUTY SPEAKER (Mr. Rainville): I might call attention to the fact that this is the second reading of the Bill. Perhaps those questions would come up more properly when the Bill is in committee.

Mr. PUGSLEY: I think the Government is acting wisely in increasing the rate of interest to four and one-half per cent. Investment in dry docks has not proven very attractive to capitalists.

A Dry-dock Act has been on the statute-book since 1882. Various attempts have been made to construct dry-docks under its provisions but no dock of the first class has been built. Under the Act as first passed the subsidy was at the rate of three per cent of the cost. It was afterwards increased to three and a half per cent, and then to four per cent. Even with the increases from time to time, there has been very little done in the way of taking advantage of the offer. Some docks of the second class have been constructed; for instance one at Collingwood. I think that

was followed by a second one of the second class. There is also a dock at Port Arthur. Then there is a floating dock at Montreal, and one at Prince Rupert. A graving dock of the first class is pretty expensive. The cost would run up to $4,000,000 or $5,000,000 and the capitalists have not found the proposition sufficiently attractive to take hold of it. In view of the high rate of interest to-day, I should think that four and a half per cent would be a reasonable rate of interest to prescribe. With regard to the other change, that bonds may be issued when $1,000,000 has been expended, I observe by the Bill that the proportion is only 75 per cent. My experience was, when I was a minister that one of the serious drawbacks against capitalists taking hold of the proposition was that the investor felt that his security ought not to be dependent in any way on the ability of the company to operate the dock. Under the original statute it was provided that, if at any time the company should cease to operate the dock, the interest on the subsidy should cease. The matter was brought to the attention of the late Government when I was Minister of Public Works and Mr. Fielding was Minister of Finance. The Government recognized that objectionable feature of the statute and a change was made by which it was provided that when the Government accepted the work and engaged to pay the interest that should be irrevocable and should continue for the period specified whether the dry-dock was operated or not. Provision was made that the Government should take charge of the dry-dock and operate it, charging up any expenses of operation to the company, but notwithstanding, the paymeent of the subsidy should continue for the specified period. As I understand, the only change that is now made is that an agreement is made by you to pay the subsidy on what you might call progress estimates, no payment to be made until the expenditure has reached the sum of $1,000,000. I should suppose that the margin of 25 per cent ought to be reasonably sufficient to ensure the full completion of the dry-dock, and also that it would be a desirable change make because you can understand how difficult it would be for any company to finance the whole $5,000,000. It makes it an easier proposition if bonds on progress estimates can be financed during construction. On the whole I would think that the change is a reasonable one. The subsidy is limited to cases where, in the opinion of the Government, a dock of the first class is necessary in the public interest. I very heartily approve of the Bill. I think there is one slight change that ought to be made.

Mr. HAZEN: You want to put in the words "per annum?"

Mr. PUGSLEY: Yes.

Mr. HAZEN: I have that noted.

Mr. A. K. MACLEAN (Halifax): What is the policy of the Government with respect to the construction of a dry dock at Halifax? There has been, in the annual estimates, for some years, a sum for the construction of a dock there, and I have always understood that it was provided for the reason that it would be required partially for naval services. I also understand that on many occasions the British Admiralty have urged the construction of a dock of the first class at that port. When this resolution was introduced, I said that the policy of paying a certain rate of interest for a period of years on an issue of bonds was calculated to encourage purely promotion schemes, which was undesirable. The chances of an expensive dry dock being a very profitable project in Canada are very slight indeed either on the Pacific or Atlantic coast. I did urge on that occasion that great care should be taken by the Government in entering into contracts for the construction of dry docks. A dock, for instance, should not be constructed at Yarmouth, N.S., or somewhere on the St. Lawrence under the Act, simply because some promoter represents to the Government that he desires and is in a position to construct such work. That would be bad policy. The point I wished to make, however, was that if it is the policy of the Government, or the desire of the British Admiralty to have a dock of the first class at the port of Halifax, primarily or partially for naval purposes, the question then arises whether or not the Government should build the dock of Canada in conjunction with the British Admiralty. I have an idea that if the Government secured the services of a reputable contractor to build the dry dock upon the basis of cost, plus a small percentage of profit, in the end a very substantial amount would be saved in the construction. I would not be surprised but that a competent contractor, building on a force contract basis, could build a $5,000,000 dry dock for at least $1,000,000 less than would be required by a company. I fear it is the practice of private companies, when constructing dry docks to increase improperly

the cost of construction. I would like to present that view to the minister, and I would like to know if the construction of a dry dock at Halifax for naval and commercial purposes has been considered as a matter of policy by the Government.

Mr. HAZEN: There is now a subsidized dry dock at Halifax which, of course, is the naval station on the Atlantic coast, and a very important point. That dock was built with aid from the Government of Canada, the British Government, the Government of Nova Scotia, and the city of Halifax. It has served a very useful purpose, and during the war has been extremely busy all the time. It is not, however, a dock of the first class. The first-class dock of to-day is 1,150 feet in length, and the standard fixed under this Bill is 125 feet width at the base. The Halifax dock is about 600 feet long. It is most desirable, in the interests of Canada and of the Empire, that there should be a large dry dock at an important naval station such as Halifax. That matter has been considered by the Government. I understand that my hon. friend suggests that the tendency of an Act such as this will be to induce promoters and speculators to embark upon enterprises of this sort. I do not think there is much danger of that occurring, judging from what has taken place in the past, because, as has been pointed out by the hon. member for St. John (Mr. Pugsley), no dry dock of the first class has been built under the provisions of the Dry Dock Act up to the present time, and I doubt whether, even with the changes being effected now, promoters, people not bona fide interested in the development of shipping, will be induced to go into enterprises of this sort, because the maintenance of a dock after construction involves large expenditures, and unless those who build such docks can see a fair prospect, after completing the dock and supplying the plant, of doing a considerable volume of business at a fair profit, it is most unlikely that they will put their money into such an enterprise.

Mr. PUGSLEY: There is no guarantee of principal.

Mr. HAZEN: No. All they get is this amount for a period of thirty-five years, and the amount is barely sufficient, if it is sufficient, to pay the interest on the full amount. Thus they must desire a considerable revenue from the operations of the dock. It is very desirable that, at Halifax on the east coast, and at some point on the west coast, Esquimalt or Vancouver, there should be first-class docks, in the interest of the defence and of the trade of Canada, and also of the larger interests of the Empire. The matter has been considered by the Government, and no doubt by previous governments, and when the hon. member for Winnipeg (Mr. Rogers) then Minister of Public Works was in England in March and April last, the matter was taken up with the Imperial authorities. He had many interviews with officials of the Admiralty, the Foreign Office and the Colonial Office, and urged the necessity, from the standpoint of the Empire itself, of constructing docks on both the Atlantic and Pacific coasts, of a size that would make them available for the accommodation of the largest war vessels and commercial vessels now afloat. The hon. member for Winnipeg has just informed me that he has some interesting correspondence on that subject which he had with members of the British Government, but that it is impossible for him to lay his hand on it this afternoon; and he has suggested that the matter be allowed to stand until the next sitting so that he may have an opportunity of giving that information to the House in more detail than he can do to-day. Under those circumstances, I suggest that we pass the second reading, with the understanding that we go into committee on the Bill at the next sitting.

Motion agreed to and Bill read the second time.

SUPPLY.

House again in Committee of Supply, Mr. Rainville in the Chair.

Public works chargeable to income—St. John harbour, extension of and repairs to Negro Point breakwater, $250,000.

Mr. NESBITT: How much is there in the main estimates for this?

Mr. HAZEN: Nothing.

Mr. MURPHY: Is this a new work?

Mr. HAZEN: It is an extension of an old work.

Mr. SINCLAIR: Will the minister explain it?

Mr. HAZEN: The acting Minister of Public Works (Mr. Reid) is away to-day, and has asked me to bring the matter before the committee. It was before the committee on a previous occasion and there was some criticism of it. A good many years ago, during the time that the constituency

of St. John was represented by the late Hon. Isaac Burpee, it was decided to extend this breakwater running from the western shore of St. John harbour to Partridge island.

Mr. PUGSLEY: Mr. Chairman, I wish to bring before you the question of the irregularity of the present proceedings. I do not think the committee is properly constituted. There was no motion for the Speaker to leave the Chair. On every day except Thursday and Friday, the Speaker can only leave the Chair on motion put. The hon. member for Edmonton (Mr. Oliver) rose to his feet and was desirous of making some remarks. Under the rule, the Speaker leaves the Chair without motion put on Thursdays and Fridays.

Mr. HAZEN: My understanding was that on Saturdays the same rule prevailed as on Fridays, and I think that will be found in the motion to take Saturdays.

Mr. PUGSLEY: The motion, which I have before me, reads that the order of precedence on Saturday shall be the same as on Fridays. That does not change the rule that on all days except Thursday and Friday the Speaker can only leave the Chair on motion put.

Mr. HAZEN: I have been proceeding on the idea that on Saturdays exactly the same procedure shall be followed as on Fridays.

Mr. PUGSLEY: My hon. friend will see how important it is.

Mr. HAZEN: Perhaps it would be well to get the Speaker's ruling.

Mr. PUGSLEY: That might be done.

Mr. HAZEN: We might pass the item and then report progress and obtain a ruling, without prejudice.

Sir WILFRID LAURIER: But if the committee is not properly constituted, what would be gained by passing the item?

Mr. HAZEN: I move that the committee rise, report progress, and ask leave to sit again this day.

Motion agreed to, and progress reported.

And the House having resumed.

Mr. PUGSLEY: Mr. Speaker, the occasion for the committee rising was that it might be clearly understood what is the proper course to be pursued on days other than Thursday or Friday. I raised the point that we could not go into Committee of Supply on Saturday without a motion put that you leave the chair. My hon. friend the Minister of Marine and Fisheries (Mr. Hazen) said that he was under the impression that it was quite proper for us to go into Supply to-day without question put, and I think he was sustained in that view by the clerk assistant. The motion passed on the 22nd of June was as follows:

> On motion of Sir Robert Borden, it was resolved, that on and after Saturday, the seventh of July, proximo, and on Saturdays until the end of the present session, the House shall meet at three o'clock in the afternoon; and the order of precedence on Saturdays shall be the same as on Fridays.

I maintain that that does not in any way affect the rule of the House that on Thursdays and Fridays you leave the chair without motion put, but on other days the motion must be put.

Mr. SPEAKER: I am not in a position to give a reasoned opinion at the moment on the point of order raised by the hon. member for St. John. I left the chair, taking it for granted that the procedure on Saturdays would be precisely the same as upon Fridays, and under Rule 17C I left the chair without putting any question.

Sir WILFRID LAURIER: If the motion of the Prime Minister had been that the procedure on Saturdays shall be the same as on Fridays there would be no difficulty, because the procedure on Fridays is that you leave the chair, Sir, without any question being put. But his motion was not as to the procedure, but as to the order of precedence. The motion simply provided that on Saturdays the same order of business should prevail as on Fridays. As a rule, the Government, at the beginning of a session, takes Tuesdays and Fridays, but on all other days the business of private members has precedence.

Mr. SPEAKER: As the point raised is one of considerable importance and requires careful consideration, I would prefer to take the matter under advisement and have time to give a reasoned opinion. At the moment, if pressed for a ruling, I would rule that I can leave the Chair on Saturdays without question put.

Mr. HAZEN: There is no disposition to press your Honour for a ruling at the moment. I think, without prejudice, we might by unanimous consent of the House go into Committee of Supply, and His Honour might be able to give his ruling on the point of order raised next Monday.

Mr. PUGSLEY: Perhaps that would be better.

SUPPLY.

The House resumed in Committee of Supply, Mr. Rainville in the Chair.

Mr. HAZEN: I had started to say that a number of years ago, when the Government of Mr. McKenzie was in power, steps were taken to protect the harbour of St. John from storms by the construction of a breakwater extending from Negro Town point on the western side of the harbour across to Partridge island at the entrance of the harbour. That breakwater has been constructed for a certain distance, but there is a gap remaining between the end of the breakwater and Partridge island. The intention always was that that gap should be filled, as will be seen by any hon. gentleman who has curiosity enough to go to the Public Works Department and look at the plans that have been on file there for many years past. An agitation, however, arose on the part of the schooner owners and others, who complained that if the gap was closed they would have to take a longer route around Partridge island in order to enter the harbour, and as a result the work was delayed for many years. The agitation has now entirely ceased, and to-day there is no opposition by any interest in the community, to the construction of this work.

Mr. NESBITT: Do they know about it?

Mr. HAZEN: It has been talked about for twenty years. There is a universal feeling that the closing up of this gap is essential to the safety of the port and for the protection both of the private wharves and those wharves that have been constructed of late years at considerable expense by this Parliament.

Mr. SINCLAIR: What has caused this change of view?

Mr. HAZEN: At the present time practically all the vessels coming into the harbour are propelled by steam or gasolene. There is not a fishing boat that comes up from the island or along the shore that has not a gasolene engine in it, and there is consequently little trouble in running the mile or two extra to get around the island. In addition to that, the schooner trade is not as important as it was in years gone by. The necessity for this work had been recognized, I think, for very many years past. It has been recognized by those interested in the business of the port, and the construction of the work has been urged from time to time by the Board of Trade and other public bodies. In 1914, some time before the outbreak of the war, tenders were invited for the construction of the extension to this breakwater. The tenders were received soon after the outbreak of the war. It was stated in the House the other day that the work was not proceeded with because the Government thought the tenders too high, but that was not the case. It was not because of the price at all, if I recollect the circumstances, for the officers of the department considered the price fair and reasonable; but the work was not gone on with, because the war having broken out, it was thought desirable to retard construction of all public works as much as possible. Conditions to-day, however, are such that I think it is imperatively necessary that the work should be proceeded with.

Mr. NESBITT: Has the war stopped?

Mr. HAZEN: Not at all. I am talking about other conditions, as the hon. gentleman would have heard if he had been patient for a moment. A great deal of dredging has been done in the harbour of St. John. Lying across the harbour and forming a natural breakwater, to a certain extent, was what was always spoken of as the Beacon Bar. This formed a natural obstruction to the waves as they rolled through the gap. This bar has practically been all dredged away during the past five or six years for the purpose of giving a better entrance to the harbour and better facilities for shipping generally. That obstruction having been removed, the waves caused by westerly gales now come with great force through that gap in the breakwater. On several occasions they have come across the harbour and caused damage to private wharves on the east side. In addition to that, striking against another obstacle, they are deflected back into the berths which have been in the course of construction at West St. John for some years, causing injury to the docks, and, on one or two occasions, rendering them unsafe for shipping. Sometimes the ships have had to be moved out of the docks and taken into the stream. The expenditure made by the Dominion Government at St. John during a number of years past, while running into large sums, has been bringing in considerable revenue. As a result of the construction of these wharves it was possible to send through the port of St. John last year exports to the value of over $200,000,000, an amount which exceeds the value of the goods exported from the port of Boston during the same period. Further than

that, last year the wharfage dues at St. John amounted to over $100,000, or four per cent on an expenditure of $2,500,000. This would largely cover the interest on the expenditures made there up to the present time. It is anticipated that during next winter the receipts will be much larger because shipping will be more extensive. The Canadian Pacific Railway Company has spent a considerable sum in improving yard room and extending sidings along its line between Montreal and St. John. I am informed that the company will be in a position next winter to handle about 15 or 20 per cent more trade than it was able to handle last season. If this work is not carried on, there will be great danger in two respects. The privately owned wharves on the east side of the harbour may be seriously damaged—some were damaged last winter and the winter before. Then there is the danger of damage to the wharves that the Government has constructed at very considerable expense, and of injury to ships lying in the docks during storms which in some winters are of a serious character. For these reasons it was thought advisable to put this item in the estimates this year and to call for tenders for the work. For my part, I wish that the work could have been delayed; I am sorry that it is necessary to ask the country to make the expenditure at this time. But having regard to the importance of the shipping interests at the port of St. John, to the importance to the whole country of having the wharves maintained in safe condition and of giving the necessary protection to the harbour generally, it is only right and proper that this work should be proceeded with if it can be proceeded with at a reasonable figure. Tenders were asked for the work again this year. In 1914 the lowest tender—I speak in round figures—was something over $800,000. This year the lowest tender was about $738,000. There is another tender $50,000 higher, and there are six or seven, all of which are considerable higher than the two to which I have referred. I understand from the Public Works Department that the tenderers are people of reputation and financial ability. The lowest tender is even lower than the lowest of 1914. The work would have been proceeded with had it not been for the conditions caused by the war, which has lasted much longer than we anticipated at that time.

Mr. MURPHY: Has the contract been awarded?

Mr. HAZEN: No, it cannot be awarded until the item is adopted by the House.

Mr. MURPHY: What is the departmental estimate of the cost of the work?

Mr. HAZEN: About $200,000 higher than the two lowest tenders.

Mr. SINCLAIR: The minister has said that some dredging was done, a bar was removed and this work made necessary. Was the dredging done at the place that we are now proposing to fill up?

Mr. HAZEN: Oh, no, it is inside of the breakwater. The engineers insist upon the necessity of this work. They say that in the future, in order to secure the needed protection of the harbour, a breakwater should be built from the eastern side of Partridge island running towards the eastern shore in the direction of Red head. However, for the present the work proposed will be very useful. It will protect wharves of very great value on the east side of the harbour; it will protect the Government docks on the west side and the shipping that comes to that port. It would be serious indeed if disaster should occur to any of the ships loading valuable cargoes to be carried overseas. The enormous development of the port of St. John in the last few years, and the revenue which is being collected through the Department of Marine and Fisheries in the way of wharfage dues, constitute in themselves a justification for proceeding with this work. In normal times I am satisfied that there would not be the slightest objection to its being proceeded with.

Mr. NESBITT: This is a partial vote; the total expenditure the minister estimates to be $738,000?

Mr. HAZEN: This is a partial vote. A vote has been kept in the estimates practically every year since 1914, because it was felt that some time the work would have to be proceeded with.

Mr. PUGSLEY: Some years ago when I was Minister of Public Works my attention was called to the importance of this work. We were then deterred from going ahead with it only because of the large expenditure that would be involved. Of course, as the minister states, the business of the port has increased enormously since that time, and any expenditure that is reasonably necessary to protect the wharves and the shipping is thoroughly justified. I think

the minister omitted to mention one reason why this work should be proceeded with. The dredging which has been done in the harbour on the west side has been at Beacon bar, to which my hon. friend referred. A further harbour improvement has been the deepening of the channel leading out from the harbour to the sea. The depth of the channel has been increased to about 28 feet, so that larger steamers may enter and depart without waiting for the rising of the tide. But the channel runs past this open space between the end of the present Breakwater and Partridge island.

The depth of the channel, of course, is very much greater than the depth of the space between the end of the breakwater and the island. The result is that, when storms come from the southwest, a great deal of silt is carried in and deposited in this deep channel, which is being dredged. That must necessarily injure the channel and will add very greatly to the cost of construction of the breakwater in again deepening the channel. There will, therefore, be a very great saving in connection with the keeping of the channel at the proper depth by the construction of this breakwater. That is quite an important point which should also be considered. I am sure the minister will agree with me as to that.

Mr. MACDONALD: I very greatly regret that I am compelled to disagree with the hon. member for St. John (Mr. Pugsley), and also with the Minister of Marine and Fisheries. They make out a good case for certain improvements in the port of St. John, but the same kind of a case could be made out for an improvement in almost any other part in eastern Canada. I should consider myself derelict in my duty if, at this period of the session, in view of the tremendous financial obligations of this country, I should silently assent to the proposition that money which has been obtained from the people of this country through taxation for war purposes of that kind. Already during this session, on the estimates that have been brought down, we have voted appropriations for different purposes with absolutely no regard for the terrible financial position in which this country is placed. We hear much talk about "winning the war" and about this, that and the other thing being done for the purpose of winning the war. We have taxation to win the war. We have a Franchise Act to win the war. Any man of intelligence, of course, knows that all that is mere talk.

Before the war the total interest obligations of this country did not amount to more than $15,000,000. To-day the financial obligations of this country involve an annual expenditure of from $110,000,000 to $120,000,000 in interest upon mortgages which have been placed upon this country. In addition to that, we have an annual charge of $30,000,000 for pensions to our soldiers. That means that the preliminary obligations of this country, before we can spend a dollar for anything else, will amount hereafter to from $140,000,000 to $150,000,000.

Mr. R. B. BENNETT: Surely my hon. friend is in error in stating that the total annual interest charge is $110,000,000.

Mr. MACDONALD: That amount is correct.

Mr. R. B. BENNETT: That is the interest at 5 per cent on over $2,000,000,000.

Mr. MACDONALD: Yes.

Mr. R. B. BENNETT: The debt of this country has not yet reached $1,000,000,000.

Mr. MACDONALD: I am sorry for my hon. friend. He has not been following the facts.

Mr. R. B. BENNETT: I have.

Mr. MACDONALD: If my hon. friend will take the Canada Gazette, which contains the statement of the debt of this country at the end of July, he will find that the amount of the debt at that time was $1,542,000,000.

Mr. R. B. BENNETT: I refer to interest-bearing debt.

Mr. MACDONALD: That is interest-bearing debt.

Mr. R. B. BENNETT: No, that is the gross debt.

Mr. MACDONALD: That is the interest-bearing debt. My hon. friend will find on the other side certain assets. The debt of this country, which is concentrated in bonds and debentures, is interest-bearing, and that is the statement. My hon. friend will also remember that we added $650,000,000 of debt to the obligations of this country in assuming the obligation to pay the interest upon that amount of money, including the bonded indebtedness and the existing interest-bearing indebtedness of the Canadian Northern. I put the figures on Hansard about two weeks ago in the presence of the Minister of Finance, and he did not question them.

5 p.m.

Mr. R. B. BENNETT: My hon. friend knows very well that all that this country is liable for is the difference between the net earnings of that system and what may be necessary to pay the interest on its funded debt, which difference has never yet exceeded $15,000,000.

Mr. MACDONALD: My hon. friend, in the first place, forgets that, in regard to that obligation, we have to pay the interest upon the bonded indebtedness. Then there is bank indebtedness which is in the vicinity of $100,000,000. Then there are the equipment bonds and there is other current indebtedness, all of which I put in detail upon Hansard some two weeks ago. In addition to that, if my hon. friend will take the capital expenditure which has been voted this year, he will find that to-day the bonded indebtedness and the current indebtedness of this country, upon which indebtedness we have to pay interest, is in the vicinity of $2,250,000,000.

Mr. R. B. BENNETT: No.

Mr. MACDONALD: I will ask my hon. friend to read my statement. I will later on give him the page of Hansard on which I made the computation. I say that is so. If we have to raise $140,000,000 or $150,000,000 in this country every year before we can spend a dollar for carrying on the ordinary affairs of the country, while I know this is a splendid public work and while I have nothing to say as to the arguments put forward by the representatives from St. John on its behalf, the time has come in this country when we must cease expending on building breakwaters or other public works of that description, money which is obtained from the people under the guise of war expenditure. Any one who looks these things squ rely in the face knows that next year the Minister of Finance of the day will have to bring down an Income Tax Bill so as to include incomes of $500, and every one knows we shall have to resort to a land tax in order to raise sufficient money to meet all our needs. If that be so, why should we listen to the eloquent member for St. John who tells a beautiful story about the conditions at that port? Other hon. gentlemen representing other constituencies could, although perhaps not as eloquently as my hon. friend from St. John, tell a story that would appeal very strongly to the sympathies of us all. But at the same time, if it be the case that you have to keep on taxing the people almost beyond bearing in order to get this money, it is time we stopped building breakwaters and such things. If what I have stated is the exact financial condition of the country—and it is so—then we have no business to vote money for such purposes as this.

Mr. NESBITT: I understand from the minister that he has in the main estimates an appropriation of $100,000 for this work.

Mr. PUGSLEY: Not this year.

Mr. HAZEN: Not this year.

Mr. NESBITT: I understood the minister to say so.

Mr. HAZEN: I said we had kept that amount in the estimates for some years. It is not in this year's main estimates.

Mr. NESBITT: I was going to suggest that, on account of the lateness of the season, $100,000 would perhaps be more than could legitimately be expended on the work this year. Even, although that amount is not in the main estimate, I still think what my hon. friend from Pictou (Mr. Macdonald) has said, is correct, namely, that we keep on voting every few days some large amounts of this kind towards the construction of public works that could possibly be done without during the war. These items are like drops of water—each one unimportant, but all combined making a great total. We have already this year reached a very large figure as the total expenditure for public works, some of which could very well have been done without.

It is not necessary that the items should be mentioned again, because we spoke of some of them at the time they went through. I agree with my hon. friend from Pictou (Mr. Macdonald) that this is a public work in favour of which, perhaps, much could be said. The minister told us that agitation had been carried on against it for about twenty years, but that the agitation had been given up. I imagine it was given up because people had become tired. If you constantly propose doing a thing for a certain number of years, everybody gets tired of objecting. However, that may be, when you consider that work had been contemplated for twenty years and it was not found necessary to undertake it, I think it could go for a while longer. The probabilities are that the storms mentioned by the minister will not occur again. In any event very little of this money can be utilized this year. It is getting late in the season now, and the nights are becoming cold. I think the minister might very well drop this item until another year.

Mr. SINCLAIR: I was a little puzzled over the minister's statement in regard to this expenditure. He said the bar was dug in the other channel. I cannot understand how the digging of a bar in the other channel would bring more water into this channel which we are going to fill. Of course, I do not understand the geography of the district, and consequently I would not venture to make any criticism on that point. The minister led us to believe that a bar had been dredged from some channel in the harbour, and the water came in and destroyed the wharves. Now he proposes to fill a place where no bar was ever dug.

Mr. HAZEN: No, my hon. friend is mistaken.

Mr. SINCLAIR: Altogether apart from that, this is a new work. The minister will remember there was a very distinct understanding that no new works would be undertaken at the present time. Many new works throughout Canada have been discontinued on account of the war. It was understood that the works which were cut out of the estimates should have first place after the Government resumed the construction of new works. This improvement means an expenditure of about three-quarters of a million dollars, and I think we should not embark on it at the present time. There is a great deal in what my hon. friend from Pictou has said to the effect that we require all the sinews of war we can get for the purpose of carrying on our part in this great conflict, and that we should not ask people to contribute money to a work of this kind which has been advocated for, I think the minister said the other night, forty years. If the people have been able to do without it that long, I do not see any reason why it should be gone on with now. We are asking the people to buy post office bonds amounting to $25—notices are published throughout the country asking the women and children to save their money and invest it in those war bonds, and women in isolated places are saving all the money they get for their eggs and chickens until they can accumulate $25 which they will invest in a war bond. We are now proposing to spend 10,000 of these war bonds in order to give the minister sufficient money to build a breakwater in St. John harbour. He is asking a quarter of a million dollars now, but he will want three-quarters of a million before he gets through with the work. I wish to enter my protest against this item.

Administration of Justice—Yukon Territory —Allowance to John Black for performing duties of judge of the Territorial Court for 16½ months, $687.50.

[Mr. Nesbitt.]

Mr. OLIVER: Perhaps the minister would give a short statement as to the origin of this somewhat peculiar item.

Mr. DOHERTY: Mr. Black is clerk of the Yukon Territorial Court, and legal adviser to the commission. For two periods during which Mr. Justice Macaulay, who is the only judge in the district, was absent on leave, Mr. Black was appointed acting judge and performed the duties of the judge. These two different periods together covered sixteen and a half months. It is proposed to allow him the difference of $41.66 per month, between his actual salary in the office which he permanently holds, and the judge's salary. It was thought fair and equitable to allow him this for taking on these additional and heavier duties during the absence of the judge.

Mr. NESBITT: Will the minister tell us how much Mr. Black has drawing from his own position at the same time.

Mr. DOHERTY: The judge's salary is $5,000 a year. The monthly difference between that and the clerk's salary is $41.66, so that it would be just a matter of calculation to determine his salary.

Mr. CARVELL: Is not Mr. Black Commissioner to the Yukon?

Mr. DOHERTY: No, he is the Clerk of the Yukon Territorial Court and legal adviser to the commission.

Mr. MACDONALD: There are less than 9,000 people in the Yukon and it costs us about $1,000,000 to look after them. With all due deference to the gentleman who may be holding the office of judge, I cannot accept the proposition that we should spend any more money there under present conditions.

Mr. DOHERTY: I am not in a position to say just what the administration of the Yukon costs as a whole. At the same time we are only dealing with this item of $687.50, which I consider a reasonable allowance to this gentleman for taking on those additional duties during the absence of Mr. Justice Macaulay. I think we could hardly be taxed with extravagance for recognizing this absolutely reasonable claim under the circumstances.

Mr. NESBITT: Will the minister tell us what Mr. Justice Macaulay was doing during those sixteen months? Was he on a holiday?

Mr. DOHERTY: He had leave of absence I think. With regard to one of the occasions I quite recall the facts. Mr. Justice Macaulay was given leave on account of the condition of his health and that leave was prolonged by the fact that on his way home he met with an accident on the train which caused quite a long sojourn in the hospital.

Mr. MACDONALD: We are paying a colossal sum of money for the maintenance of less than 9,000 people in the Yukon. It will be a matter of computation as to how much a head that would be. That is not merely the population of Dawson, but of the whole Yukon Territory. The judge there does what an ordinary police magistrate does in any eastern town for $800 or $900 a year, and glad to get it.

Mr. NESBITT: The division court clerk could run it.

Mr. DOHERTY: It would hardly be suggested that it would be desirable that we should have no Superior Court judge in the district. The judge has been called upon to deal with capital cases and some cases of very great magnitude on the civil side. When this Administration came into power there were three judges in he Yukon.

Mr. MACDONALD: But there were very many more people.

Mr. DOHERTY: I think the dimunition had practically taken place at the time, because shortly after we came in we felt justified in doing away with two of these judges. We have but one judge, and, at Dawson, he performs the duties of a High Court judge, and also performs the duties of a magistrate sitting at the trial of criminal cases. There was some criticism of the fact that he should occupy the two positions, but still, from reasons of economy, we have thought it well to maintain that condition of affairs. The length of the absence of the judge in one case was certainly due to unavoidable causes. I think the circumstances justify the allowance. I have simply the direction of judicial matters the total expenditure in connection with the administration of the Yukon Territory is not within my control.

Mr. OLIVER: I do not see any objection to passing this vote. It seems very reasonable that this man, who is performing important duties over and above those that he is ordinarily paid for, should receive some consideration for it. But it is quite obvious, if the Yukon Territory can get along for sixteen and a half months without the presence of a Superior Court judge, the presence of a Superior Court judge during all the time is not necessary.

Mr. DOHERTY: That absence was in two different periods.

Mr. OLIVER: I understand that. I do not wish to criticise the Government adversely as to maintaining a judge of the High Court as well as this gentleman who seems to be considered competent to do the work. They have to face a condition of decreasing population. But decreasing population means decreasing responsibility and decreasing litigation. They are not to be charged with extravagance because they are maintaining a position that existed previously, or as if they had created that condition. They are, to a certain extent, the victim of circumstances. But the conditions being such, the question arises whether the High Court business of the Yukon Territory could not be done by a visiting judge quite as well as by a resident judge when we have there an official who, I presume, in the opinion of the Department of Justice, is competent to carry on the ordinary business of the court. I do not urge that the Government should make any particular changes, but the higher the standard of the judge who is responsible for the decision of cases the better for litigants and everybody concerned. It is not reasonable to expect that you could get the highest class of judge for High Court work in Dawson for $5,000 a year. It would be more economical and would really give better administration if, in due course, the work of the low-paid resident judge in Dawson were displaced by the work of a proportionately more highly paid judge who could visit Dawson from time to time to attend to the High Court work. Dawson is not inaccessible now; it is as easily reached as almost any other place. It is only a matter of four days from Atlin, where there is judicial work carried on. There is not now the necessity of maintaining a high-class judicial establishment and a full staff in Dawson that there was in times gone by.

Mr. DOHERTY: I think that is quite true, but the opportunity for making that change will only arise to practical advantage when there is a vacancy in the position of judge. The judge is permanently appointed, and if we should make the change now I do not think we would be entitled to refuse to pay him his salary.

Mr. OLIVER: When a vacancy occurs at some other place on the bench it might be useful to remove the present incumbent in the Yukon. It is not necessary that the change should occur immediately in the Yukon.

Penitentiaries—To provide for a bonus of $100 to each penitentiary officer who was in receipt of a salary of $1,000 or less on April 1, 1917, $26,500.

British Columbia—To pay a compassionate allowance to Mrs. Mary Jane Mackenzie, widow of the late George Mackenzie, industrial guard, $1,200.—$27,700.

Sir WILFRID LAURIER: What is the explanation of this bonus?

Mr. DOHERTY: In view of the high cost of living, it has been decided to grant to those employees of penitentiaries who draw salaries of $1,000 and under a bonus to tide them over this year. It is not an increase in salary, but a temporary payment for this year. It is in line with what has been done in several other departments and what was done by the amendment to the Civil Service Act in the case of some of the inside civil servants.

Mr. OLIVER: On what basis is the compassionate allowance to this widow fixed?

Mr. DOHERTY: This is not under any fixed arrangement; otherwise we would not need to ask the vote. The circumstances make this case very exceptional. Under the penitentiary law, a man who is retired for illness is entitled to a gratuity which represents a proportion of his salary for the number of years he has served. That proportion is arrived at by taking the salary of the last three years. The husband of this widow served for over thirty-two years in the British Columbia penitentiary. He died from a sudden attack of heart disease, leaving his widow, with a large family of little children, in abject property. Had he been retired through illness, he would have been entitled to a gratuity of, I think, $1,700 or $1,800; but as he died suddenly his case does not come under the Act. On inquiry I find that it is most unlikely that other cases of a similar kind will occur, so that this will not be establishing a precedent. It is a compassionate allowance pure and simple.

Mr. OLIVER: I hope I shall not be accused of suggesting extravagant expenditures to the Government when I say that, while I feel we should be careful as to the amount of money we expend, I also feel that in the cases of many classes of officials of the Government we should have some system by which consideration will be given to them if they retire because of physical unfitness, or to their dependent families in case of death. Many of the great institutions of the country have adopted that principle. In the case of penitentiary officials and others where special trustworthiness is required and where the remuneration is by no means large, I believe the public interest would be served by carrying out the principle now invoked in the case of men retiring owing to physical unfitness. Where a faithful man has left a dependent family it would not be going too far to give to that dependent family the full amount of the so-called gratuity to which, under the system adopted in the penitentiaries, the man himself would have been entitled had he been retired because of physical unfitness.

Post Office Department—civil government—To provide for an increase in salary of the superintendent of Mail Contracts Branch to $4,500, $750.

Mr. MACDONALD: There is a matter, not relating to this item, which I should like to bring to the minister's attention. The town of New Glasgow is desirous of having a letter carrier system adopted in the town. I do not know whether it comes within the limits of population and revenue prescribed by the department but the town has increased in population and importance very considerably of late years, and I think it should be granted a letter carrier service. Has the minister received any reports from his officials on the subject?

Mr. DOHERTY: We require a population of 12,000 and a revenue of $20,000.

Mr. MACDONALD: Perhaps the minister would inquire whether he has received any application from the town itself, and let me know on Monday.

Mr. DOHERTY: I shall be glad to make inquiry.

Mr. SINCLAIR: I cordially support this increase in salary. I have known this officer for many years, and have always found him painstaking and most obliging and satisfactory in every way. I do not think this is at all too much for a man of his ability. I should like to say a word on a matter which I brought up in the House last year when the Post Office estimates were up. I do not know whether any attention has been paid to the matter by the department or not, but I think that some consideration should be given to those places that are distant for a considerable number of miles from railway stations, by

getting automobiles to carry the mail in place of the old-fashioned system of couriers. In Nova Scotia the railway runs through the centre of the province, and there are practically no branch lines, and many villages have grown up at a distance from the railway stations. Rural delivery is not satisfactory on a route of forty miles or more, with people settled all along the route, because by the time the mail arrives at the end of the road it is very late. One thing these people want is a sufficient number of post offices along the route, and also a quick delivery by motor car. There is no doubt that it would be a great convenience. It has been taken up already in some places by private enterprises, but I should like to see the department ask for two classes of tenders; one for a service carried by a motor car, in the summer especially, and the other, for a service carried in the old-fashioned way. If this was done the minister would be able to see the difference in cost. Personally, I do not think it would cost a great deal more to have the mail delivered by automobile. The livery stable people very often have charge of these long routes, and in the summer season they could use their horses for other purposes. I can assure the minister that it would be a great accommodation to these people to have the mail delivered by motor car especially in the summer season. In places where the automobile has been adopted by private enterprise people are now getting their mail at four o'clock in the afternoon, whereas they did not get it until nine o'clock at night under the old system. The minister will see that the automobile delivery would be a great advantage, and if it can be done at not too great a cost, I think it should be done.

Mr. DOHERTY: This work is done under contract, of course. We do not furnish horses and wagons or motor cars for the carriage of the mail, and therefore it would be a matter of ascertaining whether we could find people who would contract to deliver the mail by automobile, and who would not charge an unduly greater price than is charged by the men who now have the contract. I shall be very glad to look into the matter of comparative cost, and if the difference in cost is not too great I would be disposed to agree with my hon. friend as to the advantage of adopting the other method.

Mr. SINCLAIR: I do not think there should be very much difficulty about it. The deputy minister knows that the department specifies the class of vehicle that is to carry the mail—a one-horse or two-horse rig and so on. It would be an easy matter for the department to stipulate that during certain months of the year the mail shall be carried by automobile.

Post Office Department—To provide for an increase in salary of the superintendent of Mail Contracts Branch to $4,450, $750; to provide for an increase in salary of the accountant to $4,000, $500; to provide for the salaries of two clerks in First Division, subdivision B: one at $2,700, one at $2,300, $5,000; to hereby promote G. A. D. Mailleue, F. M. S. Jenkins and T. M. Oliver from Third Division, subdivision A, to Second Division, subdivision B, at $1,250 each, and Joseph Marier at $1,200, $4,950; to provide for the promotion of thirty-two clerks from Third Division, subdivision A, to Second Division, subdivision B, $1,600—$12,800.

Mr. OLIVER: I notice that it costs $4,950 to promote four men, and only $1,600 to promote thirty-two men. How is it that one party comes so much more expensive than the other?

Mr. DOHERTY: I understand that in the case of the four men their salaries are $1,200 each. Their promotion to a higher class involves an increase of $50, and their promotion leaves vacancies in the division they have just left. If the vacancies in the lower class are not filled, of course the money will lie there. But putting these clerks into this class necessitates providing salaries for clerks in the class from which they are promoted. Thirty-two clerks in the Third Division, subdivision A, are, under the Civil Service Act recently passed, entitled to promotion to Second Division, subdivision B, and to provide for that $50 each is required for thirty-two men.

Pensions — European war—further amount required, $2,000,000.

Mr. OLIVER: What amount has already been voted for pensions?

Mr. HAZEN: I have a statement from the Board of Pension Commissioners showing the amount that will be required for the year. The total amount required is $8,000,000, made us as follows:

1. Pensions already granted—	
Amount paid for pensions in Canada and England for months of April, May and June, 1917.....	$1,253,470
Estimate of pensions to be paid from July 1, 1917, to March 31, 1918..	3,021,637
	$4,275,107
2. New Pensions—	
New pensions estimated at $1,800 per month from July 1, 1917, to March 31, 1918, at average of $400 per pension per month..	$2,700,000

The average of $400 per pension per month is based on past business; 1,000 pensions for April, 1917, working out at $450 per annum, and at the same number for May, 1917, working out at $380 per annum.

3. Gratuities (for disability—Class 6)—
Gratuities paid April, May and June, 1917 .. .. ..$ 29,400
Estimates from July 1, 1917, to March 31, 1918, average $300 per month for 9 months at $50 per gratuity.. 135,000
——————$ 164,400

$ 7,139,507

4. Estimated expenses of administering pensions—
Salaries, rentals, etc... .. .. ..$ 470,000

The total has been put, in round figures, at $8,000,000. The amount of $2,000,000 is further required, in addition to the amount provided in the main estimates, in order to meet expenses up to March 31 next.

Mr. SINCLAIR: What is the maximum amount allowed to a totally disabled soldier?

Mr. HAZEN: According to the report made to the House last year, and made effective by Order in Council under the War Measures Act, in the event of total disability a private gets $480.

Mr. SINCLAIR: There is no change?

Mr. HAZEN: There has been no change up to the present, but the Prime Minister has stated to the House that he intends under the War Measures Act to increase that amount, having regard to the advance in the cost of living and to other considerations.

Mr. SINCLAIR: Can the minister say how much the increase will be?

Mr. HAZEN: No, it has not been fixed. In fact, it has not yet been definitely considered.

Mr. OLIVER: My information is that there is grave reason for complaint in respect of the action of the pension commissioners in dealing with claims involving less than total disability. Perhaps it would be better, under all the circumstances, if we did not pass the item now, because it is a matter of very great importance and might very well be the subject of some slight discussion in the House.

Mr. HAZEN: If the hon. gentleman wants the item to stand over until next day that will be all right.

Civil Government—departments various—To pay to each of the officers, clerks and employees in the Second Division, who obtained the ordinary annual increase during the present year on or subsequent to the first day of April, 1917, and previous to the coming into force of the Civil Service Amendment Act of 1917 an additional amount of $50, $29,825; to provide for any increase of salary under the Civil Service Amendment Act of 1917, not otherwise provided for therein, $32,500—$63,325.

Mr. HAZEN: That is to carry out the legislation which was passed this year, which, hon. members will remember, gave the $100 increase instead of the $50 increase. The original estimates were based on the statutory increase of $50. This is to make up the difference.

Progress reported.

REPORT PRESENTED.

Regulations re pay and allowances to officers and men after discharge from the Canadian Naval Service.—Hon. Mr. Hazen.

On motion of Hon. Mr. Hazen the House adjourned at 6 p.m.

Monday, September 17, 1917.

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

FURTHER SUPPLEMENTARY ESTIMATES FOR 1917-18.

A message from His Excellency the Governor General presenting further supplementary estimates for the year ending March 31, 1918, was presented by the Hon. J. D. Reid (Minister of Customs) read by Mr. Speaker to the House, and referred to the Committee of Supply.

MILITARY SERVICE ACT, 1917.

ORDERS IN COUNCIL APPOINTING REGISTRARS FOR THE DIFFERENT PROVINCES.

Rt. Hon. Sir ROBERT BORDEN (Prime Minister) laid on the table of the House Orders in Council appointing registrars under the provisions, and for the purposes, of the Military Service Act, 1917, for the provinces of Ontario, Manitoba, Saskatchewan, Quebec, New Brunswick, British Columbia, Prince Edward Island and Alberta.

Sir WILFRID LAURIER: May I suggest that they be printed forthwith?

Sir ROBERT BORDEN: They only give the names. I shall read them:

Ontario—Glyn Osler, Esq., Barrister at Law, Toronto.

Manitoba—E. R. Chapman, Esq., Director of National Service for the province of Manitoba, Winnipeg.

Saskatchewan—A. L. Haining, Esq., Director of National Service for the province of Saskatchewan, Saskatoon.

Quebec—Eugene Godin, Esq., K.C., Montreal.
New Brunswick—William A. Ewing, Esq., K.C., St. John.
British Columbia—Robert S. Lennie, K.C., Vancouver.
Prince Edward Island—William W. Stanley, Esq., merchant, Charlottetown.
Alberta—John M. Carson, Esq., Barrister at Law, Calgary.

Mr. A. K. MACLEAN: Is Nova Scotia mentioned in that list?

Sir ROBERT BORDEN: No registrar has yet been appointed for Nova Scotia. I think some inquiry has been made of a gentleman in that province as to whether he would be willing to undertake the duties. I presume no reply has yet been received and for that reason no appointment has yet been made.

PRINTING OF PARLIAMENT.

Mr. J. A. CURRIE moved:

That the recommendations contained in the third, fourth, and fifth reports of the Joint Committee of both Houses on the Printing of Parliament be concurred in,

Sir ROBERT BORDEN: I would like my hon. friend (Mr. Currie) to allow that motion to stand until we have had an opportunity of examining the reports.

Mr. CURRIE: The fourth report is the only one that deals with the question of public printing. The third and fifth reports might go through.

Sir ROBERT BORDEN: I do not know what they are.

Mr. CURRIE: They simply deal with the documents that should not be printed.

Mr. SPEAKER: I would recommend that the motion should stand. I am not so sure that it does not embrace a portion of a report which the Printing Committee made and which is ultra vires. I suggest that the motion stand until to-morrow and in the meantime I will inquire into the report.

Motion allowed to stand.

THE PROCEDURE OF THE HOUSE.

RULING BY MR. SPEAKER ON APPLICATION OF RULE 17C WITH RESPECT TO COMMITTEE OF SUPPLY.

On the Orders of the Day:

Mr. SPEAKER: On Saturday the hon. member for St. John (Mr. Pugsley) raised a point of order that the Order of the House of the 22nd of June made upon the motion of the right hon. the Prime Minister (Sir Robert Borden):

That on and after Saturday the seventh of July, proximo, and on Saturdays until the end of the present session, the House shall meet at 3 o'clock in the afternoon, and the Order of Precedence on Saturdays shall be the same as on Fridays.

did not make rule 17C, which provides that

On Friday when the Order of the Day is called for the House to go into Committee of Supply or of Ways and Means Mr. Speaker shall leave the Chair without putting any question.

also apply to Saturday. I find, on examination of the Journals, that the practice of the House has not been uniform since the adoption of the new rule, though under similar conditions in sessions previous to the present one there are only two instances when a motion has been made to go into Supply on a Saturday. I do not consider, however, that the rule has been long enough in existence to support the view that the House has adopted any particular practice upon the question, especially as the point has not heretofore been raised. The wording of the Order of the House of the 22nd of June merely relates to the Orders of Precedence, which is regulated by rule 25, and I do not think that its terms are wide enough to include rule 17C, which is a rule of procedure specifically confined to two named days. In my opinion, therefore, the point of order taken by the hon. member for St. John was well taken.

CANADIAN EXPEDITIONARY FORCE.

CASUALTIES REPORTED FROM AUGUST 16 TO 31, 1917, INCLUSIVE.

Sir WILFRID LAURIER: The other day the hon. the Minister of Militia and Defence (Sir Edward Kemp) gave us some information with regard to the casualties in the Canadian Expeditionary Force and he promised to bring down a detailed statement.

Sir EDWARD KEMP: In answer to my right hon. friend the leader of the Opposition (Sir Wilfrid Laurier), I beg to present the following statement:

Statement of Casualties of the Canadian Expeditionary Force Reported to Militia Headquarters During the Period From August 16 to 31, 1917, Inclusive.

	Officers.	Other Ranks.	Totals.
Killed in action	70	837	907
Died of wounds	12	301	313
Wounded	288	5,895	6,183
Prisoners of war	3	8	11
Died whilst prisoners of war		2	2
Missing	24	121	145
Died of disease	4	21	25
	401	7,185	7,586

HOLIDAY FOR OVERSEAS FORCES.

On the Orders of the Day:

Hon. CHARLES MURPHY: Mr. Speaker, for the purpose of asking a question, may I direct the attention of the right hon. the leader of the Government (Sir Robert Borden) to a cable despatch which appeared in all papers on Thursday last, the 13th inst., and which is as follows:

Adelaide, South Australia, Sept. 13--The Director General of Recruiting states that arrangements have been made to send 50,000 of the original Australians home for the holidays, irrespective of whether similar reinforcements are sent. The Director General believes that the visit of these gallant men will give a great stimulus to recruiting.

I would like to ask my right hon. friend it he has any information in regard to the subject of this cablegram; if so will he communicate it to the House, and whether any such steps as that which is alleged to have been taken by the Australian Government is contemplated by this Government with reference to the Canadian troops?

Sir ROBERT BORDEN: We have no official confirmation of the particulars of this despatch. I shall make inquiry by cable and ascertain whether there is any foundation for it.

EXEMPTION TRIBUNALS.

On the Orders of the Day:

Mr. GAUVREAU: According to news received from my riding, the judge is under the impression that the person to be chosen for appointment to the local tribunal must have residence in the place selected for the tribunal. Is that the law, or can he be chosen from another place than his place of residence?

Mr. DOHERTY: The law makes no provision requiring that a man should be taken from the locality. It is a matter for the judge in making the appointment to appreciate the qualifications of the man. If I were asked for a personal opinion, I should say that, generally speaking, a thoroughly competent local man might present advantages that another would not.

CANADIAN EXPEDITIONARY FORCE.

REGULATIONS AS TO OFFICERS ON LEAVE IN CANADA.

On the Orders of the Day:

Sir EDWARD KEMP (Minister of Militia): The hon. member for Pictou (Mr. Macdonald), on Saturday, inquired whether any new order had been made regarding officers who had returned from overseas and who wished to return to civil life. The only militia order that could possibly have any bearing on that question was issued on June 26, 1917. A circular letter has also been sent out, bearing date 29th August, 1917.

Mr. MACDONALD: Perhaps the minister would read the circular letter.

Sir EDWARD KEMP: It reads:

Department of Militia and Defence.

Circular Letter.

Ottawa, 29th August, 1917.

(H.Q. 54-21-50-44.)

From—The Adjutant General, Canadian Militia.

To—All Officers Commanding Districts.

Retention of officers in Canada on leave.

Sir,—I have the honour, by direction, to inform you that the following cable has been received from the C.O.M.F. authorities overseas:—

"Do 1266—August 15th—Owing to number of officers now available here considered officers now on leave in Canada number approximately 250 should be given opportunity of being retained for duty there or to resume civil occupation if they so desire. Not desirable in my opinion officers on leave on medical grounds should be returned unless fit for general service expiration of leave. Requested names of officers retained should be cabled this headquarters."

2. In view of this cable it is requested that you will please furnish Militia Headquarters, as soon as possible, the names of all those officers, C.E.F., at present in Canada on leave from overseas, and who are still on the strength of the C.O.M.F., who wish to return overseas, and those who wish to remain in Canada.

3. With regard to those who remain in Canada, it should be explained to them that, if possible, they will be given further employment but if you have no employment available for them they will be struck off the strength of the C.E.F., and, if eligible, transferred to the strength of the C.E.F. Reserve from the date on which their leave expires.

4. It is requested that in ascertaining the opinions of the officers in the District under your command that the purport of the cable received from England, and the whole matter should be made clear to them.

I have the honour to be, Sir,

Your obedient servant,

(Sgd.) W. E. Hodgins, Major General,
Acting Adjutant General.

PRIVATE BILLS.

GORDON DIVORCE BILL NOT REPORTED FROM COMMITTEE.

Resuming the debate on the proposed motion of Mr. Edwards, "That Mr. Speaker do now leave the Chair for the House to go into Committee of the Whole on Bill No. 126, intituled: "An Act for the relief

of Albert Edwin Gordon," and the proposed motion of Mr. Steele in amendment thereto (resumed from September 7.)

Mr. HUGH GUTHRIE (South Wellington): Mr. Speaker, I was addressing the Chair when the hour for Private Bills expired on the 7th September. I wish merely to add that I think every member has received a complete copy of the evidence. Having gone over the matter with some care, and having given it the best consideration I am able to bestow on it, I feel that my vote in the committee was fully justified by the evidence. I think the respondent has been guilty of such conduct as to entitle her husband to the divorce asked for. I think, on the other hand, there has been no evidence of condonation on the part of the husband sufficient to deprive him of the relief he now seeks. During the married life of these parties there have no doubt been occasions when both have been more or less blameworthy. But the acts of adultery charged against the wife in these proceedings all took place after a separation which had been agreed upon between the parties. I have no hesitation in coming to the conclusion that this petitioner is entitled to the relief which he asks.

The adoption of the amendment, which proposes to refer the Bill back to the Private Bills Committee for further consideration, would probably result in killing the Bill for this session. This unfortunate petitioner had a Bill before Parliament in 1915, but the time elapsed and no conclusion was to come to. He came again this year in good time—the evidence was taken in the Senate in June—and it would be a grave hardship if the House did not take some action on it at this time, instead of referring it back to the committee, which will probably not meet again during the present session.

Amendment (Mr. Steele) declared lost on the following division:

YEAS.

Messieurs:

Armstrong (Lambton),	Laurier (Sir Wilfrid),
Bennett (Simcoe),	Lewis,
Boivin,	McKenzie,
Copp,	Morphy,
Currie,	Morris,
Doherty,	Morrison,
Donaldson,	Nicholson,
Gauvreau,	Oliver,
Graham,	Papineau,
Hartt,	Robidoux,
Hughes (Kings, P.E.I.),	Sexsmith,
	Shepherd,
Hughes (Sir Sam),	Steele,
Kyte,	Taylor.—28.
Lapointe (Kamouraska),	

NAYS.

Messieurs:

Bennett (Calgary),	Maclean (Halifax),
Borden (Sir Robert),	McCurdy,
Boyce,	McLean (Queens, P.E.I.),
Boys,	Meighen,
Burrell,	Northrup,
Carvell,	Pugsley,
Charlton,	Reid,
Clark (Bruce),	Roche,
Clark (Red Deer),	Rogers,
Cockshutt,	Smith,
Crothers,	Stewart (Lunenburg),
Davidson,	Thoburn,
Foster (Sir George),	Tremain,
Glass,	Turriff,
Guthrie,	Wallace,
Henderson,	Weichel,
Kay,	Wilson (Wentworth). —37.
Kemp (Sir Edward),	
Loggie,	
Macdonald,	

Mr. SPEAKER: The question is on the main motion.

Mr. CARVELL: Before this vote is taken, I want to point out the unfortunate position in which I find myself with regard to this Bill. I do not know whether I ought to vote or not, but I desire to show the utter absolute nonsense of granting divorces by the Parliament of Canada—

Some hon. MEMBERS: Hear, hear.

Mr. CARVELL: —and the necessity of having a divorce court, if divorces are to be granted. I suppose that I am to blame in this matter. I should have taken the trouble to read the evidence, but I am pretty busy, and I have not had the time to read it. I am asked to sit here as a judge, and render a decision on such a serious matter as dissolving the marriage contract between man and wife, and I have to do that without the faintest knowledge in the world as to what I am doing. All I can do is to accept the judgment of those who have dealt with the case. I understand the Bill has received the endorsement of the committee of the Senate and the committee of the House of Commons. I presume they have gone over the evidence. I must take it for granted that these committees have given the case their best consideration and while I understand these committees were pretty nearly evenly divided, yet the majority in both committees decided in favour of granting divorce, and all I can do is to accept the decision of the majority of those committees, and vote accordingly, or else retire from the Chamber. I take this occassion to point out the absurdity of the whole proposition.

Sir ROBERT BORDEN: My hon. friend is aware that a joint committee of the Senate and House of Commons is endeavouring

at the present time to bring about some reformation in the procedure to which he refers. I do not think the question to which my hon. friend has addressed himself, would arise on this particular Bill until the House goes into committee. I voted against the amendment because when the House goes into committee there is opportunity to discuss the evidence and consider whether or not the Bill should be reported. If the committee, with the evidence before them, come to the conclusion that the evidence is not sufficient to justify the granting of the divorce, then this House would not be justified in reporting the Bill. If, on the other hand, the majority of the committee decide that the evidence is sufficient, the Bill should be reported, and go through, in the ordinary course. That was my reason for voting in favour of referring the Bill to committee.

Mr. W. H. BENNETT: When the Bill was before the committee I voted against granting the petition for two reasons: the first was that the evidence was not before the House. I also voted against it because I had heard part of the evidence discussed and I believe the parties should be left where they were. The woman is not an angel, as hon. gentlemen will see by reading the evidence, and the man is certainly not a very good man.

Mr. E. M. MACDONALD (Pictou): The question before the House is purely judicial. This House is acting in a judicial capacity, in a line with the action of a court of appeal dealing with the decision of a court of first resort. In the trial of the case, the judge has the opportunity of seeing the witnesses, of observing their demeanour and forming those impressions which, in a case of this kind, ought to be the deciding element in any matter where there is a conflict of testimony. I entertain much the same views as my hon. friend from Carleton (Mr. Carvell) with regard to the almost ridiculous method by which in certain provinces in Canada people have to come to Parliament in order to dissolve the marriage ties. But, pending some reformation and some change, we have to perform our judicial duties in that respect. I have the utmost confidence in the gentlemen who compose the Senate Divorce Committee. The chairman of that committee is a well known and distinguished member of the bar in my own province, a man in whose integrity and capacity I have the greatest confidence. I believe the members of the tribunal which deals with these matters in the Senate are the best judges of the evidence. I think we in this House ought to accept the conclusions arrived at by that committee, unless we have evidence indicating that they were departing from the general rules and principles which guide them in divorce cases. Unless a lobby is made, or pressure brought to bear, or some efforts are put forth to influence individual members of this House in particular cases, we should, I think, be disposed, if we were performing our duty, to accept the verdict of the men who compose that Senate Divorce Committee. It would be wrong to adopt any other course, unless hon. gentlemen had given the greatest possible attention to the evidence, and had undertaken to perform those functions which a judge of the court of appeal would perform, in reviewing the evidence taken before a subordinate court. I have not done that, and I believe few hon. gentlemen in this House have read the evidence. I think the sound rule is that we should accept the decision of the men who have passed judgment upon this evidence. It is a well known principle of law that appeal tribunals will not reverse the decision of a court of first instance, and more particularly the verdict of a jury, where the demeanour of the parties, their character, their antecedents and all these questions are at the very basis of a proper determination. That principle should be followed in regard to divorce cases.

Every hon. gentleman who has taken part as counsel in divorce cases before the courts of this country knows that these are the determining factors in the decisions in such cases. In view of the fact that our function is a purely judicial one; that we are acting as an appellate tribunal, it is the bounden duty of this House, there being no evidence that the other court, the Senate, erred grievously or overlooked some important consideration in coming to the conclusion which they did, to accept the judgment of the Senate.

Mr. G. W. KYTE (Richmond): I do not accept the suggestion of the member for Pictou that the House of Commons is an appellate tribunal taking cognizance, as it were, of an appeal from the Committee of the Senate or the Committee of the House of Commons. In my judgment, we are the tribunal. We as the House of Commons delegated certain functions to the Private Bills Committee. These functions having been discharged, it is for us to consider whether or not the Committee of the House of Commons properly discharged their functions, having regard to the evidence

which was submitted to them for their consideration. I do not desire to enter into any examination of the evidence that is to be found in this rather bulky volume which has been placed on the desks of members of the House. I desire to say only that I read the evidence carefully and I cannot satisfy myself that any evidence has been disclosed to justify the House of Commons in passing this Bill. The most that has been alleged against the respondent is matter of inference which has been explained. No direct evidence is alleged against her of having committed the only offence for which we should be justified in passing this Bill. The suggestions which have been made by the witnesses for the petitioner have been completely set aside by the absolute denial of the respondent herself and of the other witnesses, persons whose names were associated with hers. That being the case, there is nothing for this House of Commons to do but to vote against the Bill.

Mr. J. A. CURRIE (North Simcoe): Mr. Speaker, when this Bill was before the House on a previous occasion I was strongly of the opinion, as I always have been, that it is not proper for the House to interfere with the rulings of the committee; that this House should not discuss these divorce cases or turn itself into a divorce court. After reading the evidence, however, I have reached a conclusion quite in line with that held by the majority of the legal gentlemen who have spoken. I wish the House to note this: there was a judicial separation between these parties before a judge, and this woman was granted alimony amounting, I think, to $1,000 a year—an amount which was subsequently reduced to $800 a year. This woman is entitled to that alimony now, and if she has been so wicked that it is necessary to have a divorce the facts in the matter should have been first brought before the judge who granted the alimony. The judge could have deprived her of the alimony, and the husband could then have come with clean hands to this House and to the Senate and said: "the courts have virtually thrown out this woman's case; I want the House now to give me a divorce." If the House passes this Bill it will be interfering with a decision of the courts—and I should be the last person in the House to say that the judge did wrong. If this husband has a case against the woman let him go and get the alimony cancelled. From a reading of the evidence it seems to me that the idea on the part of the husband is to get the House to grant him a divorce so that he may avoid the payment of $800 a year to his wife. This House, therefore, should proceed slowly and cautiously. The husband had recourse; he could have gone to the court, asked for a review of his case, and, upon the evidence that is now before us, requested that the alimony be struck off. He has not done that. He has passed by the courts; he comes to this House and wants us to give him something which he knows the judge would not give him. For that reason I intend to vote against the second reading of the Bill in this House. This man ought to have another year during which to pay alimony to this woman—and to see whether he can find greater grounds for divorce than those which he has submitted. I repeat that he should go before the judge who granted the alimony; if the judge decides that the woman is unworthy, he will strike off the alimony and the husband can come here with clean hands and ask for a divorce.

Mr. W. B. NORTHRUP (East Hastings): Mr. Speaker, I quite agree with a previous speaker who called attention to the pitiable state of the law in this country, when a body such as this has shown itself to be is asked to grant or to refuse a divorce. The hon. gentleman who has just spoken (Mr. J. A. Currie) is opposed to this divorce on certain grounds which he has stated. He is going to oppose this divorce and expects others who have listened to the chanting strains of his voice to vote in the same way upon the grounds that he has put forward. The only possible objection to be taken to the grounds that he put forward is that there is not the slightest shadow of foundation in fact, good, bad or indifferent, for practically anything that he said. The hon. gentleman said that the wife brought action for alimony; that the action was heard before a learned judge, and that alimony was granted. I hold in my hand the judgment of the court in the case which was tried, and I may point out that the good lady did not bring action for alimony; therefore the judge did not grant her alimony. My hon. friend wonders why the petitioner did not go to the judge and get his divorce from him. Perhaps no better reason could be given than the fact that the judge in an Ontario court has no more authority to grant a divorce than the doorkeeper of the House of Commons has. The hon. gentleman speaking against the sec-

ond reading of this Bill, seeks to prevent a man from obtaining what, if the evidence entitles him to it, is his right, not a favour. He opposes the granting of the divorce upon grounds which are absolutely and wholly without foundation.

Mr. CURRIE: I did not say that the woman could go to the judge and get a divorce. I said that the man could have his case reviewed by the judge, and that if the judge thought that the woman had done wrong, he could deprive her of the alimony. Then the husband could come here and ask for a divorce with clean hands. That is all I said.

Mr. NORTHRUP: The hon. gentleman has re-stated his position. He says that the man should go back to the judge and get him to cut down the woman's alimony, if it could be shown that she had committed wrong. As a matter of fact, the judge found that she was guilty, and he pointed out that he had no authority under the laws of Ontario to grant a divorce. The amount which she was being paid, $100 a month, was being paid to her under an agreement with her husband, which agreemen is printed in the evidence before the House. Under that agreement she was to receive $100 a month unless she should be guilty of some act entitling him to a divorce. The learned judge found that she was guilty; he did not feel that he could deprive her of the whole of the $100 a month, so he cut the amount down to $800 a year. Inasmuch as the motion before the Chair is that we go into committee, perhaps it would be out of place for me now to occupy the time of the House in going into evidence. May I point out, however, that this case has been before our Ontario courts; a judge has made a certain finding. The evidence has gone before a committee of the Senate and the committee has found in the same way; the evidence has gone before a committee of this House, and they have made a similar finding.

When we find all these bodies deciding that the petitioner has a case and when we find the rule of procedure laid down as it is in Bourinot Third Edition, page 787, it should be only an exceptional case in which the House should depart from the general principles that guide them in the consideration of Private Bills and it should interfere as little as possible with the decision of a committee that has fully studied the question. Under all these circumstances, I think this House might well allow this Bill to pass into the committee stage, where, if necessary it can be discussed. I sincerely hope that hon. gentlemen, who are opposing this divorce, will appreciate the situation in the Senate when they at first decided not to print the evidence, which is most painful, most humiliating to one of the parties, evidence which any hon. member cannot discuss in this House without loss of self respect and evidence which I would be exceedingly sorry to see placed upon the pages of Hansard. I hope, when the matter comes to a vote, the Bill will be allowed to carry. When it goes into the committee stage, I hope those hon. gentlemen in the committee who, under no circumstances, would vote for a divorce, will abstain from voting. If those hon. gentlemen who have not read the evidence will abstain from voting, and if only those hon. gentlemen who have read the evidence will vote, either for or against the divorce as they think the evidence justifies, then I have no hesitation in saying that the divorce will be granted.

Mr. MORPHY: I cannot for a moment agree with the hon. member for East Hastings (Mr. Northrup) in his presentation of this case to the House. I quite agree that it is very difficult, unless one reads the evidence thoroughly to appreciate and understand the case. The evidence in this divorce case is the bulkiest that, in my recollection, has ever been presented to Parliament. The feature of the case that presents itself most keenly to my mind is the remarkable difference of opinion which has existed in those bodies which have had to do with the Bill. In the Senate committee I understand the vote in favour of reporting the Bill was either five to three, or three to two. In the Private Bills Committee of the House the vote in favour of reporting the Bill was nine to eight. When two representative committees have had so much doubt that the division has been practically equal, it forces my mind to the conclusion that, before this divorce is granted,—not that hon. members should abstain from reading the evidence, as is argued by my hon. friend from East Hastings,—but that when so much is at stake, every hon. member should consider it his bounden duty, before he votes in favour of this Bill,

4 p.m.

to read the evidence and to justify his vote by the knowledge gained from that study. My hon. friend from East Hastings is making a most specious argument when he suggests that hon. members who represent the people should abstain from the exercise of their functions

in regard to a Bill fraught with such tremendous consequences to both parties to this issue. When there is such a cleavage in two bodies, showing a division of opinion and that men who have heard and read the evidence have great doubt, would it be safe to grant a divorce? If this Bill be carried, it may be carried by the vote of an hon. member who has never read the evidence, who has seen none of the witnesses and who knows nothing whatever about the matter. I cannot conceive it possible that, in the Parliament of Canada, any such haphazard, reckless method, as is asked for here of deciding a question, should become effective. It is only apropos to discuss a little of the evidence at this stage to bear out the opinion I hold. Gordon the husband admits that he has no personal knowledge of his wife's adultery. He says that this evidence is derived only from paid private detectives employed by him to follow his wife. After having entered into an agreement with her that she should not be put under espionage, that she should live as a feme sole, free from any of his espionage, he immediately put private detectives on her track and kept them there for two years. Lord Halsbury, in speaking of the evidence of private detectives, says that the court looks with strong suspicion upon such evidence. That is the only evidence presented, as I see it, in this case.

Mr. NORTHRUP: Not at all.

Mr. MORPHY: That class of evidence covers the only main points relied upon in this case. What are the main points? In the first place, these people were married and lived together for about ten years, and had two children, the boy about fourteen years old and the girl about twelve years old now. During the whole of that period there is no contention of any immorality on the part of the wife, but there were temperamental disagreements. During these disagreements, this man, who is said to come before Parliament with clean hands has been proved, on the evidence itself, pages 93 and 94, to have behaved brutally towards his wife. I ask the hon. gentlemen supporting this Bill to point out where there is any denial in toto of this brutality. This is a man who, it is claimed, with clean hands, is asking this, the highest court in the Dominion, to grant him a decree. In equity and good conscience, that cannot be done if the things given in evidence are true. This high court of Parliament is not going to extend its beneficence and judgment in favour of one guilty of such brutality. Surely we have come to a pretty pass when men of that kind have the temerity to ask Parliament for relief, if those actions of his are true, as the evidence shows they are.

The couple finally separated under a written agreement which the hon. member for East Simcoe (Mr. Bennett) has referred to. By that agreement Mrs. Gordon was to obtain $1,200 per year. He was to keep the children, and she to see them daily, Sundays and holidays excepted. On one occasion he refused to give her this money, and she was compelled to bring action against him in court; and to get her rights under that agreement she had to pay $100 in costs to a Toronto lawyer. After the separation under that agreement he assaulted her twice, and she had him summoned to the Toronto Police Court (the evidence will be found on page 100). She was fighting all the time for protection against this man, who sought to drive her from home by assaults and brutalities. Would it be surprising if a woman did not keep virtuous under such circumstances as those? But the evidence apparently shows that she did keep virtuous. With all due deference to those who take a different view, I can discover no direct evidence that this woman was guilty of any impropriety warranting the petitioner in suing for divorce.

The detectives that Mr. Gordon put upon his wife's trail for a period of over two years—he paid them, instead of paying his wife the alimony she was entitled to—found that there were two occasions upon which the petitioner relied to prove adultery. The first occasion was on a visit she paid to a dressmaking establishment in Toronto, in the company of a respectable gentleman, an acquaintance of hers for many years, whose name I will not mention, but a man of good standing and of respectable family. The other occasion was when she went into the vestibule of this same gentleman's office. No charge had ever been made by the husband against this gentleman. He stood in the light of day absolutely as a friend and nothing else. In the whole two years, the detectives who had been on Mrs. Gordon's trail day and night could discover only two occasions on which she was seen in company with this gentleman. The evidence disclosed that on the first occasion they went to this dressmaking establishment at a reasonable hour in the evening, Mrs. Gordon carrying a parcel, and it is pointed out that in Toronto the ordinary dressmaking establishment, not the higher class ones, has no de-

livery van, and the people are in the habit of carrying with them the material that is to be made up. The allegation is made that this was a house of ill-fame. That is an inference, and an inference only. The Toronto police had watched this place, but had never come forward to say that it was such. But whether it was so or not, I contend that before this woman should suffer for going to a dressmaking establishment, which, perhaps, possessed a name other than a good one, it is incumbent upon Mr. Gordon to show that his wife knew it. She swears that she knew nothing of the kind. There is not a tittle of evidence to show that his wife knew it was a house of ill-fame, even if it actually was such, and I submit that the evidence is to the effect that it was not a house of that kind. Mrs. Gordon denies absolutely that she knew anything against the house. There was no impropriety or even noise observed around the place by the police when Mrs. Gordon was there. It was not a disorderly house. Gordon asks the committee and this House to infer knowledge upon the part of Mrs. Gordon. I submit that it would be ridiculous to ask us to draw such an inference.

The other occasion was one evening when Mrs. Gordon and this gentleman entered the building on Adelaide street, near Yonge, where his office was, in order to get an umbrella. The petitioner asks the committee to infer that Mrs. Gordon went up three flights of stairs to this man's office, and there committed the act complained of. But there is not a tittle of evidence furnished even by the private detectives to show that she went up three flights of stairs. She swears she never left the vestibule, but stood there while he got his umbrella, and then they both left together. These are the two chief acts relied upon by the petitioner to show, purely by inference, that he deserves the relief for which he is praying.

Mr. NORTHRUP: How long does she swear she was there?

Mr. MORPHY: I do not care how long. My hon. friend can fix it for himself any way he likes. The evidence is entirely unsupported; there is no corroborative evidence of any kind; there is simply the fact that the woman entered the vestibule.

Mr. W. H. BENNETT: I understand that she was in the vestibule for only a very short time, about six or seven minutes.

Mr. MORPHY: There is a conflict in the evidence between Mrs. Gordon and this gentleman on the one hand, and the detectives on the other. But I would have regard to the dictum of Lord Halsbury, who states that the evidence of paid detectives must be taken with a great deal of suspicion, as they are paid to get a conviction. Their work is to earn their money, and as was pointed out the other night, a private detective in Toronto who went in search of liquor, as he passed through one establishment took three five dollar bills and put them in his pocket. He was sent to jail for it.

Mr. THOBURN: It was $20 on the last occasion.

Mr. MORPHY: My hon. friend seeks to make a point of that. It just shows what slender reeds some gentlemen will lean upon. Is it worth while for a public man to allow his mind to get warped and have a fixed view of a certain set of circumstances, which may have one meaning or another? Is it wise for him to leave room for doubt? Under circumstances where there is room for doubt, I say it is unsafe to grant a divorce. There should be some clear evidence before a deliberative assembly should take away the character of a woman who is now supporting her own children. It is a serious proposition to my mind, and one fraught with grave consequences to the rights of the people of this country. If this woman did go up three flights of stairs to this gentleman's office, which she denies, and did sit at a table in his office, there was absolutely no harm in it, if she was not guilty of an act of impropriety. I cannot conceive why some hon. gentlemen are taking such an interest in the defamation of this woman. I do not find any basis for it in the evidence.

Have hon. gentlemen such high morals that they will not grant other people the right to say that there is another kind of morals which will protect a woman against an injustice? If so let them be as free and frank as possible in this case. Let them view the matter free from all narrow bias and let them approach it with a sense of fair play and justice with regard to what the evidence proves and not overstate what is inferred or inferrable from the evidence itself. One of the strongest points in favour of this woman is that during two years of watching by detectives paid by Gordon two acts alone are found which offer any suggestion of guilt. If the woman is as bad as the man's ruffianly conduct shows him to have been, there would have been plenty of evidence brought forward, but in the

absence of such evidence are we to condemn her and her children, to put the brand of Cain upon their brows and to tarnish their reputations for life? Surely hon. gentlemen will see that in this case, where the committee divided 8 to 9 in one House and 3 to 2 in the other, we must be careful before we sanction a measure which will dishonour the name of the woman who has been so brutally used by this petitioner. They even brought in the fact that on one occasion this woman took a drink of liquor. She took a drink of liquor. Could the process of defamation go farther? Every scintilla of evidence is raked up to show that she even took a drink. That shows the combing—the fine combing—of all the acts of this woman to enable the petitioner to get around his obligation to pay her $1,200, or $800, a year as provided for by the agreement between them. "If Albert Edwin Gordon," speaking without reading, "discovers at any time after this deed of separation is executed and delivered, that there is anything in Mrs. Gordon's conduct which will entitle him to get a divorce, her alimony ceases." It is a splendid thing for him to get out of this $800 a year if this Parliament will help him. He will be relieved of the payment of this money and the woman will have to go out into the world to support herself and her children. What a splendid man this is, purporting to come here with clean hands to ask Parliament, the highest court in this Dominion, to give him freedom upon such evidence as he was presented and in order that he may save himself the payment of $800 a year. That agreement seems to have been conceived and devised to entrap this woman. It was done with the mean, astute purpose of setting a deliberate trap to get this woman into such a place that if he could find out anything about her he might be relieved of the alimony and of all conjugal rights and duties. The whole thing looks suspicious. Let us not lose sight of the character of this man who seeks relief here, as his character is shown by the evidence. This man ought to be in jail for the crime he was a party to against his wife. Why was he not prosecuted? He should be prosecuted now. Clean hands, Mr. Speaker—how can this Parliament grant this man's petition on the evidence which is not denied. The woman was in fear of her life. With a man who is battering her up against the wall, pulling her hair and assaulting her continously, a woman is not a free agent. She cannot be condemned because she would tell one story to-day and another to-morrow. The hon. gentleman (Mr. Northrup) says that she fell on a hair pin. Yes, knocked down by her husband. That is the evidence; there is no question about that. For the last nine or ten months this man, although bound to pay this woman money, has not paid her a dollar. He has defaulted on his own agreement in addition to his other foibles and shortcomings. He refuses to pay her but he has plenty of money to pay somebody to procure this evidence. She is not in a position to take steps to secure legal redress. She has no means. She is absolutely helpless unless she gets the money that he owes her but will not pay. I submit that under these circumstances, and having regard to the doubt as to the evidence and the fact that the committee in one House divided 3 to 2 and in the other 8 to 9, to the fact that many hon. gentlemen have not read the evidence and to the further fact that my hon. friend from Hastings (Mr. Northrup) has condemned the practice of asking the Parliament of this country to grant divorces, the House should hesitate before voting in favour of this Bill. The hon. member for Hastings has made the argument that this House is not competent to deal with a matter like this and yet he asks this House to give judgment when many hon. members have not read the evidence. I believe the day has not yet come in Canada when a matter of this gravity will be decided by Parliament without the members having a personal knowledge of the evidence. I am strongly opposed to and will vote against this Bill in all its stages.

Mr. GRAHAM: When this Bill was up several evenings ago I voted to have it referred back to the Private Bills Committee because members had not read the evidence. Some of them, I regret to say have not done so yet. I have read nearly every bit of evidence and I am more convinced than ever that this petitioner is not entitled to succeed on that evidence.

Mr. THOBURN: It was not my intention to go into the merits of this case until the Bill was in committee, but after hearing the statements of the hon. member for North Perth (Mr. Morphy), I feel it my duty to this House to give them some information. Having had the privilege of hearing the evidence, seeing the petitioner and the respondent, and hearing the matter thoroughly threshed out in the Private Bills Committee, I could come to no other

conclusion than that the petitioner was entitled to a Bill of divorce. To put the case as briefly as possible, this couple were married and lived together, perhaps not under the happiest conditions, for ten years. At the end of ten years they separated. The point I wanted to make was that the father and the mother of the respondent had lived in their home for a certain length of time. When the mother heard that they had separated, she went to the home to take care of it. That led me to believe that the petitioner could not be the bad man that the hon. member for North Perth tries to make him out. The respondent herself admits, according to the evidence, that there was a time when she threw a plate of hot porridge over his head.

Mr. W. H. BENNETT: Awful!

Mr. THOBURN: There was another time when she could not get into the house as quickly as she wished, and she took her umbrella and smashed the window. These incidents would not lead you to believe that she was as good-tempered as the hon. member would have us suppose.

The whole question hinges upon the respondent resorting to a house which was proven beyond doubt to be a house of ill-fame. No one could come to any other conclusion after reading that evidence than that it was a house of ill-fame.

Mr. MORPHY: A dressmaking shop.

Mr. THOBURN: I think it ill becomes learned members of this House, members of the Bar, to throw slurs upon the actions of the detectives of this country. But I am going to eliminate the evidence of the detectives altogether. And then what do you find? Two merchants, one living in the same building that this woman occupied, and another right opposite, what is their evidence? That it was a house of ill-fame. What was the evidence of the plain-clothes detective, not paid by Mr. Gordon himself, not paid by anybody that I know of? The evidence of the detective was that it was a house of ill-fame. I say that this has been established beyond a doubt. The evidence has not been denied by the respondent that she frequented that house on several occasions in the middle of the night and remained there an hour and a half or two hours and a half. Will the hon. member for North Perth tell me——

Mr. MORPHY: A dressmaking shop.

Mr. THOBURN: Dressmaking? A woman going to a house with another man in the middle of the night under the guise of going to a dressmaking establishment? I am astonished at a man of the standing of the hon. member for North Perth trying to make hon. members swallow such gush as that.

An hon. MEMBER: He meant night dresses.

Mr. THOBURN: It might have been night dresses. That is acknowledged by the respondent. Take the other occasion when they went to this house, the insurance building. What do they go to the insurance building in the middle of the night, in the middle of the month of I bruary for? An umbrella! In that building, behind locked doors according to the evidence—will you tell me what a man and a woman were doing in that building in the middle of the night, behind locked doors, looking for an umbrella? Consult the meteorological records for that month and you will find that on the very night they were there for the umbrella it was several degrees below zero. It is not necessary for me to go any further. Everything I have said is borne out by the evidence as printed, and if time would permit I would quote evidence to support every statement I have made.

Motion agreed to and House went into committee on the Bill, Mr. Rainville in the Chair.

Mr. GRAHAM: I move that the committee rise.

Mr. W. H. BENNETT: I second the motion.

Mr. NORTHRUP: Mr. Chairman——

Mr. GRAHAM: No discussion on the motion that the committee rise.

The CHAIRMAN: The motion is not debatable.

Motion agreed to on division, yeas 18, nays 15.

The committee accordingly rose without reporting.

ARMY AND NAVY VETERANS' INCORPORATION.

THIRD READING OF BILL.

The House in committee on Bill 131 (from the Senate,) to incorporate the Army and Navy Veterans in Canada, Mr. Rainville in the Chair.

Mr. BRADBURY: The Bill before the House is one applied for by the Army and Navy Veterans of Canada. This is one of the oldest organizations in Canada, having

been formed in Winnipeg a short time after the Fenian Raid. After the Northwest Rebellion an amalgamation was made, and they called themselves the Army and Navy Veterans. Since this war started they have rendered very efficient services. They have recruited, through their organization, over 5,600 men—over five battalions. Three years ago they secured a provincial charter in Manitoba. There are branches of this organization all over Canada. They are asking now for a Dominion charter. They have done splendid work. The Bill has been examined very thoroughly in the Senate and before the House of Commons Committee.

Mr. OLIVER: Are there any special powers or provisions in the Bill?

Mr. BRADBURY: I do not think so. The incorporators are: Major-General John Hughes, Major-General Henry N. Ruttan, Captain Sir Hugh John Macdonald, Lieutenant-Colonel Sir Daniel Hunter McMillan, Judge David Marr Walker, Lieutenant-Colonel George Frederick Carruthers, J. Hilliard Leech, K.C., Major George F. R. Harris, Judge George Patterson, Lieutenant William Allen Shepard, and a number of others. The objects of the Bill are: To unite fraternally all persons who have served as soldiers or sailors under the British flag, and are entitled to become members under the constitution and by-laws of the association, into a body of retired soldier and sailor veterans of a non-partisan and non-sectarian character, for purposes of good-fellowship, mutual improvement and assistance, and patriotic endeavour and service to the Empire;

To increase the public influence of veterans by organization, by parades and by giving as an entity expressions of opinion upon public questions affecting the rights of veterans or concerning the welfare of the whole or any part of the Empire;

To stimulate the spirit of patriotism in Canada and to promote, on sound and enduring principles of equality of rights, a Greater Britain, by a closer unity and co-ordination of the Overseas Dominions with the Mother Country;

To assist the Empire when occasion requires in enlisting recruits for His Majesty's forces;

To acquire, maintain and operate clubs, homes, and meeting places for the benefit of veterans, and to furnish, stock and equip the same with such furniture, furnishings, plant, animals, implements, equipment appliances, libraries, and means of entertainment and amusement, as may by the association be considered desirable.

Mr. MACDONALD: Practically all the incorporators reside in Winnipeg. What relation has this proposed incorporation to the association of veterans of the present war being formed in portions of the Dominion east of Winnipeg?

Mr. BRADBURY: Not any. It is a different association altogether.

Mr. MACDONALD: Has the situation of the men who are veterans in the present war been considered, with relation to this association? It would seem to me, with all deference to the character of the men mentioned as incorporators—and one can take no exception to them—that if it were a Dominion-wide organization it would be better to have such an organization, which will have the impress of Parliament upon it, more widely representative of the different provinces of the Dominion. The effect of this legislation is to create an incorporated body of army and navy veterans in Canada, with the incorporators residing wholly in Winnipeg. The Association is Dominion-wide in its character. We should have people from all the provinces connected with it. No one can take exception to the general purport of the measure. I can foresee a difficulty which might arise from some of the men definitely connected with the present war, who might say: "We want incorporation." Although it would not necessarily conflict with other associations, yet this would put the Parliamentary impress upon a body purely local in its character.

Mr. BRADBURY: It is the purpose to have organizations all over the country, and they have many of them now. They have branches in Ottawa and Toronto, and in every town in the North West. It is the old organization, and all they are asking is for Dominion authority. They have been doing very useful work.

Mr. MACDONALD: I am not taking exception to that. My hon. friend misapprehends my point. Organizations have been formed in different places throughout Canada by men who have served in the army and navy during the present war. The names of these bodies are pretty much the same as the name of this proposed organization. Has this measure been approved by the men who are veterans of the present war and amongst whom organizations have been formed in the eastern provinces?

Mr. BRADBURY: I do not think that that matter was considered at all. This is an old association; it has been in operation ever since the Northwest Rebellion.

Mr. MACDONALD: What is the object of their getting incorporation now?

Mr. BRADBURY: Because they are spread out all over the Dominion. They have been doing splendid work; they have recruited about five battalions in the Northwest through their own efforts. This incorporation is not intended to clash in any way with any of the other institutions to which my hon. friend refers.

Mr. MACDONALD: My hon. friend may say that it is not intended to clash, but it will clash. The men who have lately returned from the war may feel that their needs and interests and aspirations would be better served by an organization connected more particularly with their own achievements. They may feel that they have ground for complaint if we commit to a local organization in Manitoba the title "The Army and Navy Veterans in Canada." If, for instance, the army and navy veterans of Ontario want incorporation, they will not be able to get it under the title of "The Army and Navy Veterans in Canada" because Parliament will have committed that title to this Manitoba organization. If they desired to obtain the rights and privileges of such incorporation, they would have to join the Manitoba association, made up of men who are veterans of other wars. After the closing of the House we shall go back to our constituencies, and we shall find there organizations of men who have returned from the front. They may say: why did you incorporate these gentlemen in Manitoba under the title "The Army and Navy Veterans in Canada?" We want to have an army and navy organization of men who have fought in the present war.

Mr. BRADBURY: There is an army and navy organization of the Empire in Toronto; there are various army and navy organizations. We are asking for the name "The Army and Navy Veterans in Canada." By this name the organization will be distinguished from other organizations already existing.

Mr. MACDONALD: "In Canada" would include veterans of any war.

Mr. BRADBURY: These men are really the pioneers in this line; they have done excellent work; they have spent a large amount of their own money with a view to promoting the interests of the Empire. There is not likely to be any clash between this organization and any other similar body. They do not intend to do the work which is the object of the organization formed in Ottawa—that of looking after the rights and interests of returned soldiers. They are, however, forming clubs and libraries all over Canada for war veterans; that is the purpose of the Bill.

Mr. OLIVER: Are most of these incorporators residents of Manitoba?

Mr. BRADBURY: I think they are.

Mr. OLIVER: There seems to be some merit in the view of the member for Pictou that an organization which is assumed to be Dominion-wide—

Mr. BRADBURY: This is only the parent organization. They have other organizations all over the Dominion.

Mr. OLIVER: If they had in the list of incorporators representatives of these organizations in other parts of the Dominion, then what my hon. friend contends would be quite clear. But it does look as if the Manitoba organization were attempting to forestall other organizations in the use of this somewhat desirable name.

Mr. BRADBURY: For years they have had that name as a provincial organization.

Mr. MACDONALD: On behalf of the veterans of the present war who are scattered all over Canada, I object to this worthy organization in Manitoba, made up of Fenian Raid and Northwest Rebellion veterans, appropriating the corporate title of "The Army and Navy Veterans in Canada." The boys who come home from the present war are primarily entitled to that corporate title, and I object to its being appropriated by this other organization.

Mr. BRADBURY: Hundreds of men who have returned from the war belong to this association in Manitoba.

Mr. MACDONALD: Every province has its army and navy veterans who do not belong to this association.

Mr. BRADBURY: There are branches of this association in Toronto and in Ottawa. This is the parent organization.

Mr. MACDONALD: If this is to be a Dominion-wide organization, there ought to be in the list of its incorporators the names of representative men from other provinces

of the Dominion who have returned from the front.

Every hon. member knows there are in every province organizations of men who have been to the front in the present war. Those organizations have various names. They are entitled to be called the Army and Navy Veterans in Canada. Some of these organizations may ask: What right has Parliament to give that corporate title to these people of Manitoba?

Mr. OLIVER: These gentlemen asked for the name first, and perhaps they are entitled to it on that ground.

Mr. CURRIE: Army and Navy Veterans' organizations have been formed in every province, in many cities and towns. They are all organizations for old veterans of the Fenian raid and veterans of the North-west rebellion. All those gentlemen named in this Bill belong to that association. The associations in Winnipeg and in Toronto are very active, and I do not think they will interfere with the veterans of this war who are called the Great War Veterans and who do not admit anybody to membership who has not been to

5 p.m. France or Flanders. There are other associations such as the returned soldiers, who admit to membership those who have not been to the front. I understand this is to become the parent organization of other organizations of the same name throughout Canada, and as they had this name originally, it is only fair that they should retain it now. They are a very fine body of representative men of all the provinces. Col. Denison, Col. Ryerson and many of the leading officers of Ontario are in the Ontario organization. If there was any objection to this Bill, some of the Ontario men—and I think there is an assocation of Army and Navy Veterans in Ottawa—would immediately have made a protest.

Mr. ROGERS: The objection raised by my hon. friend is covered by section 3 which says:

> The head office of the association shall be in the city of Winnipeg, in the province of Manitoba, or in such other place in Canada as may from time to time be determined by the association.

The association is not confined to Winnipeg. The Winnipeg veterans lead the way, as the people of Winnipeg, of course, do in all matters.

Bill reported, read the third time and passed.

374½

QUESTIONS.

(Questions answered orally are indicated by asterisks.)

DR. A. MORTAN.

Mr. McKENZIE:

1. Is Dr. A. Mortan, of Halifax, in the service of the Government?
2. If so, in what capacity or capacities, and when was he appointed?
3. What pay does he receive from each office or position?
4. What is his total salary or allowance?
5. Does he give his whole time to the Government work or is he still attending to private practice?

Sir EDWARD KEMP:

1. Yes.
2. Regimental medical officer, 1st Regiment, Canadian Garrison Artillery; appointed 30th October, 1915. He also was attached to the Military Hospitals Commission Command for duty on the 1st February, 1917.
3. $5.75 per diem.
4. Answered by No. 3.
5. He gives more than six hours a day to his military duties, and it is understood that he also attends to a small private practice.

GEORGIAN BAY CANAL COMMISSION.

Mr. PROULX:

1. Is the Georgian Bay Canal Commission still in existence?
2. If so, who are the commissioners and the employees on the Commission?
3. How much money has each member of the Commission and each of the said employees received to date for salary, remuneration or compensation for his services?
4. Who is the secretary of the Commission?
5. How much has he received to date for salary or remuneration?

Mr. REID:

1 and 2. No.

3. W. Sanford Evans, from 1st September, 1914, to 30th June, 1917, $17,000; J. de C. Hepburn, 1st April, 1914, to 31st July, 1917, $10,800; Miss Eva Stewart, 18th May, 1914, to 30th November, 1916, $2,190; H. B. Wilcox, 27th October, 1914, to 30th June, 1916, $3,110; J. L. Busfield, 10th August, 1915, to 31st March, 1917, $4,135; H. A. Ball, from 1st December, 1916, to 15th August, 1917, $603.

4. No. Secretary's position has been discontinued.

5. Secretary received $10,800—from 1st April, 1914, to 31st July, 1917.

WINDSOR JUNCTION MAIL SERVICE.

Mr. A. K. MACLEAN:

1. What salary is paid the postmistress at Windsor Junction, N.S.?

2. Who is the contractor that carries the mails from the train to the post office at Windsor Junction, and what is the amount paid therefor?

Mr. DOHERTY:

1. Salary, $112; rent, $10.
2. Mary Hessian, $120 per annum.

GUYSBOROUGH PUBLIC BUILDING.

Mr. SINCLAIR:

1. Has any amount of money been expended in repairs in connection with the Guysborough public building this year?
2. If so, how much, and under whose direction?
3. Is there a local inspector or foreman? If so, what is his name?
4. Has the work been completed?
5. How much money, if any, was expended since November, 1911, in an effort to obtain a water supply?
6. Was it successful?
7. What is the total amount expended in connection with this building for all purposes since November, 1911?

Mr. REID:

1 and 2. $200 authorized to repair drains, build cesspool and to clean and tint the building, under the direction of Mr. W. Bishop, clerk of works for Nova Scotia.
3. No local inspector.
4. Not yet.
5. $470.35.
6. Yes.
7. $8,553.08.

LIEUT.-COLONEL JAMES ARTHURS, M.P.

Mr. LANCTOT:

1. Did Lieutenant-Colonel James Arthurs, M.P. for Parry Sound, enlist or receive a commission in the Canadian Expeditionary Forces?
2. If so, when and where, and in what branch of the service?
3. What rank did he hold?
4. Is he still a member of the Canadian Expeditionary Forces? If not, when did the term of his service cease?
5. For what period and where was he in training, was his training completed, and what time, if any, did he serve at the front in France or elsewhere?
6. At what rate per diem has he been paid, and have any of his dependents drawn separation allowance?
7. What amount has been paid to date on both accounts?

Sir EDWARD KEMP:

1. He received an appointment in the Canadian Expeditionary Force to recruit a battalion of infantry in Parry Sound district.
2. Gazette No. 9, January 27, 1916, with effect from January 21, 1916. 167th Battalion, C.E.F.
3. Temporary rank of lieutenant-colonel.
4. Yes.

[Mr. A. K. Maclean.]

5. In Canada about 11 months, partly at Niagara camp, Niagara-on-the-Lake. Served with the Canadian Expeditionary Force from date of appointment as lieutenant-colonel to the time he returned to Canada, May 14, 1917, to attend session of Parliament. Was attached to 1st Canadian Battalion, Overseas. Served in England 2 months, and in France, at the front, about 4 months. (Holds field officer's certificate, infantry, and equitation qualification.)
6. He has been paid the pay and allowances of his rank in the Canadian Expeditionary Force, and his wife has drawn separation allowance.
7. Pay and allowances of rank while in Canada, $2,478.25. Separation allowance to Mrs. Arthurs, $1,258. Total, $3,736.25.

A cable has been sent to the Chief Paymaster, Overseas, asking for amount paid him there. No reply received yet.

CANADIAN EXPEDITIONARY FORCES.

Mr. SINCLAIR:

1. What was the total number of recruits enlisted in the Canadian Expeditionary Forces during the month of August, 1917?
2. What was the total number of casualties in the Canadian Expeditionary Forces during the month of August, 1917?

Sir EDWARD KEMP:

1. 3,099, of which 1,251 from the United States. (Of the above, 1,543 were combatant and 1,556 non-combatant recruits.)
2. Casualties Overseas 10,080
   Discharges in Canada 1,283
   11,363

L. H. MARTELL.

Mr. CURRIE:

1. What is the military rank of L. H. Martell, barrister, of Windsor, Nova Scotia?
2. To what militia unit does he belong?
3. When and where did he qualify?
4. Was he attached to or did he hold a commission in any of the regiments recruited in Nova Scotia for overseas?
5. If so, what was the number of the battalion?
6. What pay did he and his family receive by way of regimental pay, allowances, subsistence, separation allowances or otherwise?
7. What was the total amount drawn?
8. Did he proceed overseas with his battalion?
9. If not, why not?
10. Is he still in the service?

Sir EDWARD KEMP:

1. Provisional lieutenant (supernumerary.)
2. 14th King's Canadian Hussars.
3. Not qualified.
4. Yes, attached.
5. 85th.

6. Lieut. Martell received the following pay and allowances:

February 23 to September 30, 1916, pay of rank, $2, 221 days	$ 442 00
February 23 to September 30, 1916, field pay, 60c., 221 days	132.60
February 23 to May 31, 1916, subsistence, $1.50, 99 days	148 50
	$723 10

7. $723.10.

8. No.

9. He was struck off the strength of the 85th Overseas Battalion, C.E.F., by the General Officer Commanding Military District No. 6 for having failed to report for duty after completing his course at the Royal School of Infantry. Lieut. Martell later reported to Military District No. 6 at Halifax that his failure to report for duty was due to ill health.

10. Answered by Nos 1 and 2.

SUBSISTENCE ALLOWANCES.

Mr. BUCHANAN:

1. Are soldiers employed in the Canadian offices in London, England, in receipt of $1.50 per diem billeting allowance, and do all privates get the pay of Orderly Room Clerks?

2. If so, why are Canadian Expeditionary Force men, who are unfit for further overseas employed in the offices in Ottawa, not placed on the same footing?

3. Has the Government any intention of placing these men in Ottawa on the same basis as those in London? If so, will the extra pay be made retroactive?

Sir EDWARD KEMP: 1. Soldiers employed in the Canadian offices in London, are men returned from the front, unfit for further military service in the field. They are graded for pay as civil clerks and allowed the equivalent of $1.00 a day for subsistence.

2. Soldiers employed in the Government offices, Ottawa, are mostly men discharged from the Canadian Expeditionary Force, and are paid as civil employees. Those not yet discharged draw a civil rate of pay in addition to their military pay and allowances.

3. The remuneration to those employed in Ottawa is considered to be quite as high as to those employed in the London offices, having regard to the higher cost of living in London; consequently, there is no intention to grant any billeting allowance in addition.

BATTLEFORD POST OFFICE INSPECTOR.

Mr. OLIVER:

1. Is it the intention of the Government to appoint a Post Office Inspector for the Battleford District?

2. Is it the intention to give this appointment to a returned soldier?

Mr. GRAHAM: The first part of this question seems to be answered by the supplementary estimates just brought down. Can the minister answer the second, which is a matter of policy?

Mr. REID: If a returned soldier is qualified to fill the position, he will be appointed. Returned soldiers will be given every consideration.

UNOPPOSED MOTION FOR PAPERS.

Mr. SINCLAIR:

For a copy of all telegrams, correspondence, requests and all other papers relating to improvements or repairs connected with the Post Office Building in the town of Guysborough, N.S., since November, 1911.

Mr. A. K. MACLEAN:

For a copy of all documents, correspondence, etc., between the Department of Naval Affairs and Messrs. McInnis, Mellish, Fulton and Kenny, of Halifax, Nova Scotia, and any other persons, respecting the purchase of the motor launch Alase.

THE DRY DOCKS SUBSIDIES ACT, 1910, AMENDMENT.

CONSIDERED IN COMMITTEE AND THIRD READING.

On motion of Hon. J. D. Reid the House went into committee on Bill No. 134, to amend the Dry Docks Subsidies Act, 1910. Mr. Rainville in the Chair.

On section 2—Dry docks of first class:

Mr. ROGERS: When we were considering this Bill last week I promised to make a statement regarding the correspondence and interviews I had when in London with the British Admiralty, respecting the construction of dry docks at Halifax and Esquimalt. Shortly after our arrival in London I took this matter up with the British Admiralty in the hope of having them consider the project favourably. On March 15, 1917, I addressed the following letter to Sir Edward Carson:

Savoy Hotel, March 15, 1917.

My dear Sir Edward,

I would like very much to have an opportunity of seeing you for a moment respecting some correspondence which our Government have had with the Admiralty respecting the dry dock at Esquimault, on the Pacific.

If you would have your secretary let me know at the Savoy when it will be possible for me to see you, I would be very pleased.

Yours sincerely,

(Sgd.) R. Rogers.

The Rt. Hon. Sir Edward Carson, K.C., M.P.,
The Admiralty.
London.

To that I received the following reply from his secretary:

Admiralty Whitehall, 17-3, 1917.

Dear Mr. Rogers,

Sir Edward Carson asks me to say that he will be very glad to see you if you can conveniently call on him at the Admiralty at 3.30 p.m. on Monday next (19 March).

Yours very truly,

(Sgd.) G. N. Steel.

I availed myself of this opportunity and called on Sir Edward. I spoke to him of the number of dry docks which the government of Canada were building, or were helping to build by way of subsidy, and he asked me to give him a memorandum of the exact position in order that he might take the matter up with his colleagues. I accordingly wrote him on March 21, as follows:

Savoy Hotel, London, March 21st, 1917.

Dear Sir Edward Carson,—

In my judgment there is very pressing need for action on the part of the Admiralty in respect to two dry docks—one at Esquimalt, on the Pacific, and one at Halifax, on the Atlantic.

The Government of Canada have undertaken and are now at work on several dry docks at our general shipping ports in Canada. For example, we are building a magnificent dock at the Port of Quebec. We have provided a magnificent floating dock at the Port of Montreal; we have also provided a splendid dock at Fort William, another at Sault Ste. Marie, another at Kingston, and are now constructing a very large one at St. John, N.B. We are also preparing for the construction of a very large dock at Vancouver. These docks, however, are not at points convenient to naval requirements.

By consulting your records you will at once see that Esquimalt and Halifax are two points in Canada that are of direct interest to the Admiralty. Our people do not like to see our British ships being taken to the Port of Seattle or elsewhere on the American side when repairs are required, by reason of the fact that the Admiralty has no dock suitable to receive large ships at either Esquimalt or Halifax.

I do wish you would have this matter looked into, and I am satisfied if you do you will have no hesitation in recommending the immediate construction by the Admiralty of a dock at Esquimalt and another at Halifax.

Yours sincerely,

(Sgd.) R. Rogers.

The Right Honourable Sir Edward Carson,
First Lord of the Admiralty,
London, England.

Sir Edward Carson and the Admiralty staff, after looking into the matter, concluded that the request of the Canadian Government was a reasonable one, and on April 4, Sir Edward wrote me the following letter:

Admiralty Whitehall, 4th April, 1917.

Dear Mr. Rogers,—

Sir Edward Carson asks me to tell you that we are sending to the Treasury to-day a further letter urging the very great importance of providing a dock of sufficient capacity, both at Halifax and Esquimalt. The First Lord thinks that, knowing this, you might wish to write or speak to Mr. Bonar Law to the same effect in the near future.

Yours very truly,

(Sgd.) G. N. Steel.

In discussing the matter with Sir Edward Carson on a previous occasion, the question had arisen whether it would be possible to get Mr. Bonar Law to provide the necessary money for the construction of these two docks.

The Admiralty, after going into the matter very fully, decided that they were prepared to go on with a dock at Esquimalt and a dock at Halifax. But the question was to secure the money from the Treasury Department. That letter was written to me and a few days afterwards I availed myself of the opportunity of seeing Mr. Bonar Law and discussing the matter with him. He was very favourable but he required to get some further information from the office of the Admiralty. I wrote Sir Edward Car on the following letter on the 17th April:

Savoy Hotel, London,
April 17th, 1917.

My dear Sir Edward Carson:—

I had a favourable talk with Mr. Bonar Law on the question of dry docks at Halifax and Esquimalt, and I am sure if you would have your department take up the question again there is every chance that it will be approved by Mr. Bonar Law's department.

Yours sincerely,

(Sgd.) R. Rogers.

Minister of Public Works for Canada.

Sir Edward Carson,
First Lord of the Admiralty,
London, England.

In view of the fact that the Treasury Department appeared to ask for further information, the following letter was addressed to me by Sir Edward Carson on the 18th April:

Admiralty, Whitehall,
18th April, 1917.

Dear Mr. Rogers:—

In reply to your letter of yesterday, I write to tell you that the Admiralty have just received a further letter from the Treasury asking us for some additional information about the question of the proposed dry docks at Halifax and Esquimalt. We shall be replying to this letter as soon as possible—and I hope, in view of what you say about the favourable talk which you had with Mr. Bonar Law, that we shall succeed in getting the Treasury to give their sanction to the scheme.

I will of course let you know as soon as we get the Treasury decision.

Yours sincerely,
(Sgd.) Edward Carson.

Then on the 19th of the same month I addressed the following letter to Mr. Bonar Law:

Savoy Hotel, London,
April 19th, 1917.

My dear Mr. Bonar Law:—

I am growing anxious regarding the matter or dry docks at Esquimalt and Halifax, about which I spoke to you a few days ago.

I sincerely hope you will be able to give me a favourable answer.

Yours sincerely
(Sgd.) R. Rogers.

The Rt. Hon. Bonar Law,
London, England.

On the 21st of April I received the following letter from Mr. Bonar Law:

Treasury Chambers,
Whitehall, S.W.,
21st April, 1917.

My dear Mr. Rogers:—

I have your letter of the 19th of April about the Esquimalt and Halifax docks. I am in communication with the Admiralty and I shall send you a reply as soon as possible.

Yours sincerely,
(Sgd.) A. Bonar Law.

After that I had one or two further interviews with Mr. Law. I saw him the day before we left England and he promised favourable consideration. They are very busy over there but I hope he will take the matter up and press it upon the Admiralty. I am satisfied from the conversations and interviews I had that the Admiralty are entirely agreed that the building of these two docks is a work belonging to themselves and I am very hopeful that it will be carried out.

Mr. A. K. MACLEAN: In the event of the Admiralty not carrying out the suggestion, has the Government any intention of going on either by itself or jointly with the Admiralty?

Mr. ROGERS: We have had several applications under the Dry Dock Subsidies Act from certain persons who are anxious to build dry docks, especially at Halifax and Esquimalt, and we always stood prepared to accept any sound proposition for the building of a dock under the Dry Dock Subsidies Act. But there always was complaint that the Act was not sufficiently favourable. As I understand the Bill now before the House, it is to provide more inviting conditions for those desirous of investing in a dry dock.

Mr. A. K. MACLEAN: There has been no further communication with the Admiralty since the date of the last letter?

Mr. ROGERS: No.

Mr. CARVELL: Personally, I am very much pleased to hear the statement made by the hon. gentleman (Mr. Rogers). I have always felt that dry docks were a great necessity. I would like to know whether, as a result of three years of war, we have really suffered from the lack of a dock at Halifax or Esquimalt. It would seem that, if ever, there must have been great need during that time. I realize that the Government could not give detailed information. Would it not have been a great advantage to have had a dry dock at Halifax or some other place on the Atlantic coast?

Mr. ROGERS: During my term as Minister of Public Works we received many complaints, especially with respect to the number of ships that had to go to Seattle to have repairs made by reason of the fact that there was no suitable dock at Esquimalt to receive them. We at one time started to build a dry dock at Esquimalt, but the war came on and then we got into correspondence with the Admiralty and it has rested there since.

Mr. CARVELL: Would that be true of the East as well as the West?

Mr. ROGERS: Not so much in the East as in the West, because ships that come to Halifax almost always have their dry dock work done in England.

Mr. REID moved:

That paragraph (a) be amended by inserting after the words "per cent" the words "per annum."

Section as amended agreed to.

Mr. A. K. MACLEAN: Is there a dry dock under construction at Levis?

Mr. REID: Yes.

Mr. A. K. MACLEAN: Is it nearing completion?

Mr. REID: It will be ready this fall.

On section 4—section 3 not to apply to existing contracts:

Mr. PUGSLEY: Might I suggest to the minister that, if possible, there should be arrangements made for the establishment of a ship building plant in connection with each dry dock so that the men could be kept constantly at work.

Bill reported, read the third time, and passed.

COMPANIES' ACT AMENDMENT.

On motion of Mr. Meighen Bill No. 129 (from the Senate), to amend the Companies Act so as to provide for the incorporation by Letters Patent of Corporations for "purposes other than that of gain," was read the second time and the House went into committee thereon, Mr. Rainville in the Chair.

On section 1, short title:

Mr. MEIGHEN: Ordinarily an Act of the importance of this would scarcely demand the attention of the House at this stage of the session; but this Bill comes to us from the Senate, where it has engaged attention since the beginning of June. As the Bill is a necessary Bill and in one sense a very important Bill, it seemed desirable to proceed with it in this House, as otherwise the labours of the Senate would have been lost. The purpose of the Bill is to amend the Companies Act so as to embody in it principles that of recent years have been embalmed in legislation in Great Britain in their Companies Act, and for the most part have also been accepted by our provinces. Our own Companies Act, as a consequence, has become rather out of date; at least it has got to be entirely out of consonance with the provincial Acts. This Bill is intended to bring our Act more into conformity with the Imperial legislation and with provincial legislation.

The first principle introduced is a provision for the incorporation of associations without share capital, and, associated with that, a provision for the incorporation of companies with shares without any par value. With regard to the first of those two principles, there is a Bill now before this House, from the Senate, providing for the incorporation of voluntary associations. That Bill will not be necessary if this is passed. The method proposed for the incorporation of associations without share capital follows the Industrial and Provident Associations Act of the United Kingdom.

Mr. CARVELL: Would the proposed amendment cover such a Bill as was put through the committee this afternoon regarding the Army and Navy Veterans?

Mr. MEIGHEN: Yes. I did not know that that was put through, and supposed that if this Bill passed it would not be necessary.

[Mr. Pugsley]

The provision for the incorporation of companies with shares without par value is the introduction of a principle that has found its way with very great success into enactments of various states, California, Delaware, Maryland, New Jersey, Maine and Massachussetts, and of the state of New York, which took the lead in 1912. In my review of the Act, I came to the conclusion that this principle was of an importance transcending that of the others. It seems to me it has in it possibilities looking to the elimination of undue capitalization, that will be of very great value.

The third principle has regard to prospectuses. Hitherto there has been no provision, practically, limiting the issue of prospectuses and their contents and the regulation of prospectuses. This is to provide for such regulation and for the liability of directors who are named in a prospectus. It provides that every prospectus shall be filed with the Secretary of State, and that the memorandum of agreement shall be embodied in it, signed by all who are named thereon and named as directors to be, or on the authority of their agents, which authority must, in that event, be filed.

Mr. A. K. MACLEAN: Is the English section pretty well followed in that?

Mr. MEIGHEN: As to that, it follows with slight alteration the section of the British Act of 1908. This legislation has been adopted without substantial modification by Ontario, British Columbia, Saskatchewan, Alberta, and to a modified extent, by Nova Scotia. This Bill simply brings the Dominion Act into conformity with more advanced legislation in the United Kingdom and in some of the provinces of Canada, and more definitely fixes the liability of directors and regulates the contents and filing of prospectuses.

Mr. CARVELL: How far does it go with respect to the liability of directors?

Mr. MEIGHEN: That is covered by section 43 A. Section 43 defines what a prospectus is. Section 43 A reads:

"43a. (1) Every prospectus issued by or on behalf of a company or in relation to any intended company shall be dated, and that date shall, unless the contrary be proved, be taken as the date of publication of the prospectus.

"(2) A copy of every such prospectus, signed by every person who is named therein as a director or proposed director of the company, or by his agent authorized in writing, shall be filed for registration with the Secretary of State of Canada, on or before the date of its publication, and no such prospectus shall be issued until a copy thereof has been so filed for registration.

"(3) The Secretary of State of Canada shall not register any prospectus unless it is dated, and the copy thereof signed, in manner required by this section.

"(4) Every prospectus shall state on the face of it that a copy has been filed for registration as required by this section.

"(5) If a prospectus is issued without a copy thereof being so filed, the company, and every person who is knowingly a party to the issue of the prospectus, shall be liable on summary conviction to a fine not exceeding twenty dollars for every day from the date of the issue of the prospectus until a copy thereof is so filed. Imp. Act, 1908, s. 80.

Then section 43 B follows. I suppose the hon. gentleman does not want me to read that section.

Mr. CARVELL: No; this follows the English Act very closely.

Mr. MEIGHEN: Yes. The liability is continued by clause 43 D on page 10, which reads:

"43d. (1) Where a prospectus invites persons to subscribe for shares in or debentures of a company, every person who is a director of the company at the time of the prospectus and every person who has authorized the naming of him and is named in the prospectus as a director or as having agreed to become a director either immediately or after an interval of time, and every promoter of the company, and every person who has authorized the issue of the prospectus, shall be liable to pay compensation to all persons who subscribe for any shares or debentures on the faith of the prospectus for the loss or damage they may have sustained by reason of any untrue statement therein, or in any report or memorandum appearing on the face thereof, or by reference incorporated therein or issued therewith, unless it is proved—

"(a) With respect to every untrue statement not purporting to be made on the authority of an expert, or of a public official document or statement, that he had reasonable ground to believe, and did up to the time of the allotment of the shares or debentures, as the case may be, believe, that the statement was true; and

"(b) With respect to every untrue statement purporting to be a statement by, or contained in what purports to be a copy of or extract from a report or valuation of, an expert, that it fairly represented the statement, or was a correct and fair copy of or extract from the report or valuation: Provided that the director, person named as director, promoter or person who authorized the issue of the prospectus, shall be liable to pay compensation as aforesaid if it is proved that he had no reasonable ground to believe that the person making the statement, report or valuation was competent to make it; and

"(c) With respect to every untrue statement purporting to be a statement made by an official person or contained in what purports to be a copy of or extract from a public official document, that it was a correct and fair representation of the statement or copy of or extract from the document, unless it is proved—

"(i) that having consented to become a director of the company he withdrew his consent before the issue of the prospectus and that it was issued without his authority or consent; or

"(ii) that the prospectus was issued without his knowledge or consent, and that on becoming aware of its issue he forthwith gave reasonable public notice that it was issued without his knowledge or consent; or

"(iii) that after the issue of the prospectus and before allotment thereunder, he, on becoming aware of any untrue statement therein, withdrew his consent thereto, and gave reasonable public notice of the withdrawal, and of the reason therefor.

It follows the British Act, which dates back to 1891.

Mr. CARVELL: This seems to refer to 1908.

Mr. MEIGHEN: The last Imperial Act was passed in 1908; it was a Consolidation Act.

Mr. CARVELL: There are decisions in the law books going back ten years.

Mr. A. K. MACLEAN: The Directors' Liability Act was passed in 1900, the result of the decision of the House of Lords in the case of Peek vs. Derry.

Mr. MEIGHEN: The Directors' Liability Act in Great Britain dates back to 1891.

The next important principle in this Bill is the provision for the reduction of capital. Hitherto, it has been held not to be possible for companies in Canada to be incorporated with a devolution of power to reduce their capital stock. That is to say, a company can be compelled to maintain its capital stock at the level provided for by its incorporation, so far, of course, as its subscriiptions have reached that amount. Consequently, it has not been possible for companies to be incorporated with power to pay off, for example, preferred stock. This Bill provides that companies may be incorporated with such power under conditions and subject to stipulations contained in this measure.

The next clause in the Bill provides for information as to mortgages. In Great Britain there has been provision for this for some time. However, in the United Kingdom it was more necessary than in Canada, because in Canada we have our provincial laws, providing for the registration of all land mortgages at Land Titles Offices, and for bills of sale and chattel mortgages at our court houses and other registration points. But even in Canada a company has been able to issue what are known as floating mortgages, and no provision is made for their registration. Fur-

thermore, owing to the fact that lands will be held in different counties, and, consequently, the registration will be at different land titles offices or registration offices in the different court houses, very considerable difficulty is entailed in locating and collecting the various mortgages.

Mr. CARVELL: In the Maritime Provinces, where we have not the same registration system as they have in the West, we have to record those mortgages in full in, perhaps, half a dozen registry offices, and it is a great expense.

Mr. MEIGHEN: It is a very cumbersome proceeding. This Bill provides that Dominion companies must file all mortgages with the Secretary of State, where a record shall be kept of all encumbrances against all companies incorporated by Dominion charter.

Mr. CARVELL: Is that the only registration necessary?

Mr. MEIGHEN: No, it seems to me we would not have power to make that the only registration. The provincial law would still compel registration as before, but this is additional to the other registration. Section 69 L reads:

"69L. The provisions of this Act respecting the registration of mortgages, charges or other securities shall be in addition to and not in substitution for the provisions of any statute of any province of Canada or of any foreign country in respect thereto."

The next principle covered by the amendments contained in the Bill is that of investigation and audit. There has been a difficulty in connection with getting investigations. If I remember correctly, under the law as it now stands, one-quarter of the shareholders may apply to a court for an investigation into the affairs of the company. For the most part, that provision has been a dead letter, and it has been felt that an easier and more readily available method should be provided. This Bill provides that the Secretary of State, unpon representation from such number of the shareholders as, in his opinion, may in a special case warrant his doing so, may cause investigation to be held. This provision will tend to much greater care on the part of companies and much greater likelihood of use by a majority of directors of the power vested in them. If my memory serves me correctly, there is a similar provision in the Bank Act.

Mr. CARVELL: In section 11 of the Bill, section 92 of the amended Act is made to read as follows:

[Mr. Meighen.]

(1) The Secretary of State of Canada may appoint one or more competent inspectors to investigate the affairs of any company and to report thereon in such manner as the Secretary of State of Canada may direct—

(i) In the case of any company having a share capital, on the application of shareholders holding a proportion of the issued stock of the company warranting the application.

Mr. MEIGHEN: I am proposing an amendment there.

Mr. CARVELL: Where there is no share capital, that provision seems to be reasonable.

Mr. MEIGHEN: As the law now stands there is no provision for compelling a company to audit its accounts. Every respectable company, of course, does not audit its accounts—annually, I think. The provinces have such provisions; I think the United Kingdom has such a provision. It is clearly interest that companies incorporated under Dominion statute shall be compelled to audit. Furthermore, there is a provision in the Bill for protection against change of auditors without due notice.

Mr. A. K. MACLEAN: Why a provision against the change of auditors without notice?

Mr. MEIGHEN: The provision is that before a change of auditors can be made, there is to be notice of the shareholders' meeting.

Mr. A. K. MACLEAN: They are selected at the annual meeting anyway, are they not?

Mr. MEIGHEN: They may be. The Bill also provides for annual returns to the Secretary of State—not annual returns of shareholders, because that would entail a tremendous obligation on many companies and be of very little value. Furthermore, such a provision could be easily contravened by the holding of shares in trust, and the like. It is eminently a Bill for the House in Committee; I think we might now take it up clause by clause.

Mr. A. K. MACLEAN: The Bill is quite an important one. The Secretary of State says that it is eminently a Bill for the House in Committee; I think I may qualify that by saying that it is eminently a Bill to be first considered by a committee of the House. It is difficult to follow this Bill in its entirety without giving some study to it first. I suppose it is almost too late now to appoint a special Committee to go through it. I should like very much to see the Bill become law.

Mr. MEIGHEN: The Senate had it before the Committee on Banking and Commerce for some months. If they had not, of course we could not assume the responsibility of such detailed and prolonged study of it as would be necessary.

Mr. A. K. MACLEAN: I introduced a Bill this session which had been prepared by a Committee of the Dominion Bar Association. The circumstances were such during the latter part of the session that I did not think the Bill would receive the consideration which it deserved; therefore I abandoned the promotion of it this session. Furthermore, I did not like the Bill which had been prepared. It was too much of a scissors and paste preparation; there were many incongruities in it; it would not have been satisfactory. I hope that at the next session, whether hon. gentlemen who are promoting this Bill are here or not, somebody will see that a new Companies Act is passed. The amendments proposed by this Bill are, on the whole, in the right direction. I have not a copy of the British Act before me, but I am under the impression that the incorporation of companies for patriotic, religious, and philanthropic purposes is provided for in one section of the British Act. I do not see why there should be any further provision than one clause giving power to incorporate such institutions under the Act. It is well, when we are basing our Companies Act upon the English Act, that we should follow the English Act as closely as we can, because then a vast amount of judicial interpretation is available from the English law reports. It is not advisable to introduce any new matter if it is at all possible to avoid doing so. In respect to the issue of share capital without par value, I have never been able to see much good in that. The first time I ever heard the suggestion was from the report made by Mr. Hadley, chairman of a commission appointed by an ex-President of the United States in respect to the capitalization of railways. There may be something to say in favour of shares without nominal or par value in the case of railways, although I have never heard its value demonstrated. It has never been used in England, and it has never been used in any of the provinces of Canada so far, and I have been informed by New York lawyers that it is not considered of very much use in that State. I do not believe it will ever accomplish the result which the minister suggested it would. The prospectus clauses are commendable, and they should be in our Act. I presume that clause in our Companies Act, which created what was called "statutory fraud"—it is the old section 48 of the English Companies Act that still remains in our Companies Act—is struck out. That is the provision that if you fail to file any paper, for instance, any contract, the company and its directors were held liable for fraud, whether there was fraud or not. It was eliminated from the English Act many years ago, but we still continued it in the Dominion Act. I am sorry the allotment clauses of the English Act were not put in this Bill, but still that would have made the Act much longer, and perhaps make it more difficult for us to pass it at this time, but I hope that some day they will be inserted. We frequently have companies organized in Canada that commence doing business before having sufficient capital subscribed. The English Act prohibits the commencement of business by any corporation until it has actually had subscribed and paid into the company the amount of money which the prospectus states would be necessary before they would go to allotment, or, in other words, before they would commence to issue shares. However, that is not in this. With respect to the reduction of share capital, clause 54A has the usual provision for inserting the words "and reduced" after the name of the company, pending the time until the Secretary of State passes upon the application. I have never been able to appreciate the necessity for the addition of these words. When the resolution is passed resolving to reduce the share capital, you must, until that is actually accomplished, have the words "and reduced" after the name of the company, and they become a part of the name of the company. I know that is in the English Act, and has been there for a long while, although many text-book writers in England regard it as rather anomalous and unnecessary. I think we should not have that clause in our Companies Act at all. I am not, however, going to ask to have it struck out now. This Bill would never get through if we were to be extremely critical of all these clauses. Does the minister know if there is any provision in our Act for paying off preference shares?

Mr. MEIGHEN: There is not now. That is one of the purposes of this Bill.

Mr. A. K. MACLEAN: Some of the provincial Companies Acts provide a summary method of paying off preference shares.

Mr. MEIGHEN: Yes.

Mr. A. K. MACLEAN: The practice in many places in Canada is this: Preference shares are issued by taking power in the memorandum or articles of association for paying off preference shares at a certain rate when the company is in a financial position to do so. As a matter of fact, the procedure in most cases is wrong and shares cannot be redeemed in that way. I think Ontario has some special provision for paying off preference shares without going through this procedure. I do not think any company should be compelled to go through all this procedure indicated by clause 54 in order to pay off preference shares when they have taken the power in their articles or memorandum of association to do so. Preference shares are shares just like common shares, it is true, but I think, when in their memorandum or articles of association, or both, as it is sometimes done, the power is taken to redeem preference shares, the company ought to be permitted to do so on the approval of somebody, possibly on the approval of the Secretary of State or by an order of the court. I am not going to suggest that the clause be struck out. It is a most cumbersome provision, and I do not think we should adopt it into our Companies' Act.

At six o'clock the Committee took recess.

After Recess.

The Committee resumed at eight o'clock.

On section 3—Companies incorporated for certain purposes. Proviso, inter-insurance contracts.

Mr. A. K. MACLEAN: Is there any necessity for having this proviso?

Mr. MEIGHEN: There is some doubt as to the power of a company incorporated by charter under the Companies Act to engage in inter-insurance. I understand that it is a modern method for companies to band together and insure each other.

Mr. A. K. MACLEAN: That is not carrying on insurance business.

Mr. MEIGHEN: Well, it is in a way. They are insuring other companies, and we want to make it clear that they can do it.

Mr. A. K. MACLEAN: Is it desirable to add this proviso? If this re-insurance is a species of insurance, it is better that the companies should not have this power. Who has raised this question? It has never been raised in the courts.

[Mr. A. K. Maclean.]

Mr. MEIGHEN: It is not the business of insurance strictly speaking, I would think, but it is a species of insurance all the same. I understand that Mr. Wegenast, who has had considerable to do with company law and is somewhat of an authority, is anxious that this protection be granted. The subject, I understand, has been litigated in the province of British Columbia.

On section 4—New sections added:

Mr. A. K. MACLEAN: Is the word "sporting" in the English Act?

Mr. MEIGHEN: I wish to move a rewording of this section. I move that:

> The words in subclass 1 of section 7a, being now, part of section 4 of this Bill, commencing at the beginning and ending at the word "gain" in the fifth line of such subclause be struck out and the following substituted therefor:
>
> When the application is for the creation of a corporation to carry on in more than one province of Canada without pecuniary gain, objects of a national, patriotic, religious, philanthropic, charitable, scientific, artistic, social, professional, or sporting character or the like.

I do not think the word "sporting" is in the British Act.

Mr. A. K. MACLEAN: It seems altogether out of place here.

Mr. MEIGHEN: I am informed that we frequently have application for such charters; for instance, from the Canadian Lacrosse and Hockey Associations. I do not see any reason why they should not come in, if they are otherwise entitled to get their charter.

Mr. A. K. MACLEAN: But it seems to be contrary to the spirit and origin of this section, which is for the convenience of corporations organized for religious and philanthropic purposes. A sporting association is an entirely different thing and should incorporate under the provincial companies Acts. There is no particular reason why they should have special privileges.

Mr. GRAHAM: Let me say a word on behalf of these amateur athletic associations. The trouble with amateur sporting associations is that they have not been properly managed during the last few years, and professional sport has driven them out. Take the National Lacrosse Association, for instance, which spreads all over Canada. In the old days there was an amateur lacrosse club in every hamlet and town in Canada, and in my opinion, if these amateur associations had been organized under a proper charter and had been properly managed, amateur sport

would not have had to give way to professional sport. I am not objecting to professional sport, but there is undoubtedly a certain development of physical and mental manhood in good amateur sport. These sporting associations are not confined to one province. The rugby football championships, for instance, before the war, were, nearly always decided between Montreal and some Ontario club. I submit that these sporting associations ought to be incorporated in the simplest possible manner. No person makes any money out of them, but many patrons subscribe for the sake of the sport. I am of the opinion that "sporting" in its true sense has its proper place in this Bill.

Mr. A. K. MACLEAN: I can understand that national, patriotic, religious, philantropic and artistic organizations might want to operate in all provinces of Canada, but I do not see that sporting organizations are on the same plane at all. Sporting is not a business, as contemplated by this Act.

Mr. MEIGHEN: None of these are businesses.

Mr. A. K. MACLEAN: The question of jurisdiction as between the Dominion Parliament and provincial legislatures could not arise. The only place a sporting organization would need a charter would be in the province of its domicile. There is nothing in our law to prevent them going out into other provinces.

Mr. MEIGHEN: Scientific organizations can do that also. Is there not just as much reason to include sporting organizations as these others?

Mr. A. K. MACLEAN: No, because frequently the work of religious organizations is spread over all the provinces, and these organizations are really carrying on a work. There is nothing for a sporting organization to do except to hold property somewhere. They may proceed from one province to another playing games, but that is not business. I do not think we should encourage the incorporation of sporting bodies under the Federal Companies' Act, but rather under the provincial Acts.

Mr. GRAHAM: The hon. member for Halifax (Mr. A. K. Maclean) and I cannot agree on this point. Take the National Hockey Association, for instance, which plays its championship games in Vancouver and Victoria.

Mr. A. K. MACLEAN: There is nothing to stop them doing that.

Mr. GRAHAM: I know. But they have a central body that decides all disputes. These ought to have a central power, so that men from every part of the Dominion would be entitled to a voice on account of their responsibility for the work and welfare of the federal organization. I have had a great deal of experience, in my younger days, in lacrosse, football and hockey and I see a great benefit in allowing these organizations to have a charter that would be Dominion-wide and to get it in the simplest manner possible.

Mr. A. K. MACLEAN: It is no good to them; it does not help them to do anything.

On section 7 B—Issue of shares without nominal or par value:

Mr. GRAHAM: An insurance company does not come under this?

Mr. MEIGHEN: No; it has to get a special charter. This is out of the New York State Act.

Mr. A. K. MACLEAN: Going back to section 7 A. Do you permit these associations to use the word "limited"?

Mr. MEIGHEN: It is not incumbent upon them under section 33 of the main Act.

Mr. A. K. MACLEAN: I mean companies organized for patriotic and philosophic purposes.

Mr. MEIGHEN: They do not need to use it.

Mr. A. K. MACLEAN: I do not see anything in the section which relieves them from it.

Mr. MEIGHEN: If my hon. friend will look at what is now sub-sub-clause (a) of sub-clause 6, page 3, he will see that section 33 does not apply. Consequently they do not need to use the word "limited". Section 7 B is a clause providing for the incorporation of companies without any par value to their share capital.

Mr. GRAHAM: Is that an American statute?

Mr. MEIGHEN: It is. It was suggested first in the United States in 1892 by an eminent company lawyer by the name of Stetson. It was further discussed at the meeting of the Bar Association in 1899. Then it was adopted in Germany and other European countries. Belgium, amongst other countries, practises this style of company incorporation. It was first put in force on this continent in the State of New York in 1912. The example there has been followed by the State of Delaware and six other states and it

is working, I understand, very well indeed. It appeals to me as the wisest way of incorporating a company. The fixing of the par value at $100 of a share of stock is not in itself a valuation. It tends to deceive the public. We speak of a company having a capitalization of $10,000,000 when perhaps the stock is only worth ten cents on the dollar. The capitalization of the company in such a case is not $10,000,000; it is only $1,000,000. The issue of a share certificate of the par value of $100 means nothing to the ordinary man buying it. The labourer, or the man who is not acquainted with company law, has the idea if he is getting it below $100, that he is getting a bargain. I never could see any reason for issuing stock with a par value at all. I do not pretend to know as much about company law as some hon. members in this House.

Mr. A. K. MACLEAN: The result will be the same.

Mr. MEIGHEN: The result is the same in the end. For any one fully acquainted with all the facts and able himself to grasp what he needs to grasp, it is all right, but it is the other fellow who has to be protected. This would lead to the elimination of over-capitalization.

Mr. A. K. MACLEAN: I do not believe it is going to do that at all.

Mr. R. B. BENNETT: The practice which has been in vogue for the last few years in New York has been to incorporate companies without attaching a value to the shares.

Mr. A. K. MACLEAN: Very little of that has been done so far.

Mr. R. B. BENNETT: It has been done very largely lately, and one of the best examples of it is that given by the Cuba Sugar Company, and other examples are afforded by other large companies of a similar character. They simply state the number of shares—so many preference shares at seven or eight per cent—and then 2,000,000 common shares.

Mr. A. K. MACLEAN: It will bring about the condition that the Secretary of State is trying to avoid. If the company has a capitalization of $50,000,000 par value with a large reserve and it desires to increase its capital issue, it will not like to do it without some reason for so doing. Large companies could reincorporate under the Act without a nominal or par value being given to their shares and they could issue a billion shares.

[Mr. Meighen.]

The value is soon established by the earnings of the company, it is true, and the market quotations for each year may not be so high; but this can be used actually to increase your capital stock. You simply have more shares.

Mr. MEIGHEN: You do not need to have this, you can increase anyway.

Mr. A. K. MACLEAN: Frequently corporations do not like to do that; they do not like to antagonize the public in some cases.

Mr. MEIGHEN: Would not the same restrictions apply here?

On section 6—tariff by Governor in Council:

Mr. MEIGHEN: There will be some expense in the administration of the Act in connection with the filing of returns, prospectuses, etc., and it seems reasonable that the companies should bear the cost of the administration, as they get the benefit.

On section 43 C—Obligations of companies where no prospectus is issued—meaning of "private company":

Mr. MEIGHEN: It will be observed that in subsection 2 the date before which this section shall not apply is given as the first day of September, 1917. I move to amend that to read "the first day of January, 1918."

Mr. A. K. MACLEAN: Is there such a thing as a private company under our Act, as there is in the English Act?

Mr. MEIGHEN: That is covered by subsection 3 of this section. We are establishing the power of restriction by this Bill.

Mr. MURPHY: They will exist after this?

Mr. MEIGHEN: Yes.

Amendment agreed to.

On section 43 D—Liability for statements in prospectus:

Mr. MEIGHEN: This is the British Act, followed in Ontario, British Columbia, Nova Scotia, Saskatchewan and Alberta. In Nova Scotia the Act is modified. I may say that in Quebec the company law has followed year by year the Dominion Companies Act. Whenever our Act was amended, the Act of Quebec was amended in the same way, and as a consequence there has been less confusion in that province. In the other provinces an entirely different course has been pursued.

On section 54—By-law for reduction of share capital:

Mr. MEIGHEN: This is the section which enables a company to reduce its share capital. I understand the Justice Department gave an opinion that a company incorporated under our Companies Act had not power to reduce its share capital, and while there has been a not very strict application of that opinion in the working out of the law, it was thought well that companies should have that power, and should have it inserted in their charter. It has application to preference stock.

Mr. BENNETT: The Canada Northwest Land Act is the best example of that.

On section 54B—objections by creditors and settlement of list of objecting creditors:

Mr. A. K. MACLEAN: I know the department here favours the control of companies by the Department of the Secretary of State. Personally, I think the English system is preferable, and that the corporations should be practically under the control of the courts. When you come to secure a reduction of the capital of a company, it is clearly a case for the intervention of the courts, because you have a conflict between minority and majority interests. For instance, a company may wish to pay off some preference shares that are outstanding. Another lot of shareholders may say the company should not pay them off and that it would be better business policy for the company to continue paying dividends on the preferred shares, and keep the capital. At any rate, you are apt to have a conflict between minority and majority shareholders, and the creditors. The rights of creditors is the principal and important question involved in the reduction of capital.

Mr. R. B. BENNETT: Otherwise it is a domestic matter.

Mr. A. K. MACLEAN: And it is clearly a case for the courts. I am not going to press my objection to-night, because I should be very glad to see the Bill go through, as it will improve the Act very much; but, should I be in the next Parliament, I shall endeavour to make amendments to this Bill, especially in respect to the matter we are now considering. I prefer the intervention of the courts in most of these matters, and the majority of the provinces have followed the English Act in that respect, and for the sake of uniformity I should think it better for us to follow that Act. It is too far to come to Ottawa from the extreme eastern and western provinces to secure some matter which might very easily be secured in the courts. I want to put myself on record as saying the Department of the Secretary of State, being a political department, is not the proper tribunal to determine a difference between majority and minority interests, or a matter which relates to the rights of creditors. I am not objecting to the administration of the department, I am speaking of the principle.

Mr. MEIGHEN: I quite understand that. I need not say I was in the department when the clause was framed, but the whole scheme of the Act seems to be to provide for the determination of these questions by the Secretary of State. Other questions just as important as this are being dealt with by him. Those who are acquainted with the working of the present Companies Act think this arrangement will be more expeditious. Perhaps, if I am Secretary of State next session, I will agree with the hon. member for Halifax.

Mr. A. K. MACLEAN: I do not blame companies for liking things as they were under the Companies Act, because it was not an Act at all, it was merely a pretense.

Mr. R. B. BENNETT: I certainly agree in the main with what has been said by the hon. member for Halifax as to the necessity of leaving the jurisdiction, if possible, with the courts, subject, of course, to filing the order with the Secretary of State. I do not think it can be regarded as sound to vest in an official here powers of the character indicated in the sections under consideration, and which, in England, have not infrequently engaged the attention of the court of appeal.

Mr. A. K. MACLEAN: It is like a winding-up procedure to some extent.

Mr. R. B. BENNETT: To some extent, of course.

Mr. A. K. MACLEAN: And that is under the courts.

Mr. R. B. BENNETT: But in view of the lateness of the session, and the desirability, if we are going to get the Act through, of attempting to amend it, I am not going to do more than express an opinion, feeling at the same time that the Secretary of State is quite right in endeavouring to maintain in his office a complete record of all the companies that have federal incorporation, and to be enabled, if pos-

sible, to supply on request as complete information as the records of the company can furnish with respect to capitalization and the manner in which it has been dealt with. But it seems unfair to parties residing at a great distance from Ottawa to subject them to the delays involved in this system. I am not saying that matters that arise will not be dealt with, but I have some doubt about the question of expedition. For instance, shareholders in Vancouver, who desire to reduce the capital of their company, for reasons that may be best known to themselves, will have considerable labour before they succeed in having a request ultimately disposed of. But if the matters were dealt with by the courts certain notices would be given and the case would come before the judge. Then the filing of the order here would give the Secretary of State all the information. The rights of the creditors would be adequately protected by notices given and by the judicial determination of the matter. But I am not going to urge the change; I merely express myself as favourable to the suggestion of my hon. friend from Halifax, rather than to the provision in the Bill.

On section 54c—order confirming reduction:

Mr. A. K. MACLEAN: I spoke this afternoon about the words "and reduced" in 54a. I should like to see them struck out.

Mr. R. B. BENNETT: So would I.

Mr. A. K. MACLEAN: But that could not be done without disarranging the whole section. These words are absolutely valueless.

Mr. MEIGHEN: That is in order to conform very closely with the English Act.

Mr. A. K. MACLEAN: The English Act with respect to the reduction of capital is very unsatisfactory to English practitioners. They object to it very much.

Mr. MEIGHEN: Section 54c is the British Act and the British Columbia Act.

On section 54e—penalty for concealment of name of creditor:

Mr. CARVELL: That is a pretty stiff penalty.

Mr. A. K. MACLEAN: It should be stiff.

Mr. R. B. BENNETT: You cannot make it too stiff and have the provision successful.

[Mr. R. B. Bennett.]

Mr. CARVELL: The provision is that a director or officer of the company who conceals the name of the creditor entitled to object to the reduction shall be liable to a penalty of five years' imprisonment.

Mr. MEIGHEN: This very point was threshed out fully in the Senate Committee. A very much lighter penalty had previously been provided—six months' imprisonment. One of the largest company men in the Senate, Senator Nicholls, of the General Electric, was most insistent that the provision would be valueless unless a substantial penalty was provided.

Mr. R. B. BENNETT: There is no question about the seriousness of the reduction of capital; that has been well indicated by the observations of the member for Halifax (Mr. A. K. Maclean). If the creditors are not made aware of the fact that capital is to be reduced, the result, of course, is very disastrous to them. It is, therefore, of primary importance that every opportunity should be given to every creditor to protest against a reduction of capital. Moreover, the Act provides that the Secretary of State, if satisfied in respect to every creditor of the company who is entitled to object to the reduction, may issue supplementary letters patent confirming the reduction on such terms and conditions as he thinks fit. Therefore, the concealment of the name of a creditor would not only affect the interests of the crediors themselves but might to some extent impair the entire usefulness of the action of the Secretary of State. I think a severe penalty is very essential.

Mr. CARVELL: The penalty is for wilful concealment.

Mr. R. B. BENNETT: The Bank of Yarmouth case is an authority on that point.

Mr. A. K. MACLEAN: What is the penalty in the English Act?

Mr. MEIGHEN: Six months' imprisonment.

Mr. CURRIE: I did not understand that this Companies Act Amendment was to be gone on with this session. The Bill stands in the name of the Finance Minister (Sir Thomas White).

Mr. MEIGHEN: No, in the name of the Secretary of State (Mr. Meighen).

Mr. CURRIE: The Finance Minister was communicated with, and he told several newspaper proprietors that the Bill would be taken up by the Private Bills Committee.

These men desire to be heard before the committee and the Government or the Cabinet in respect to several of the clauses proposed to be amended. The Retail Merchants' Association also wish to place representations before the Government before this Bill is finally passed. They communicated with the Finance Minister on the subject, and it is not any breach of confidence for me to produce the letter that the minister wrote in reply to the secretary of that association. It is as follows:

Ottawa, September, 5, 1917.

Dear Mr. Trowern:—

I have yours of the 4th instant with reference to the Act amending the Companies Act. Your representations will receive our careful consideration. It is possible that the Bill may not be proceeded with in the Commons on account of congestion of business there.

Yours faithfully,

W. T. White.

The Finance Minister told me that the Bill would not be proceeded with. I was very much surprised when I heard from Mr. Trowern that the Bill was being taken up at this late day in the session.

Mr. CARVELL: What are the sections of the Bill in respect of which the parties to whom my hon. friend refers would be injuriously affected?

Mr. CURRIE: There is one amending clause in this Act enabling co-operative companies to be established all over the country.

Mr. MEIGHEN: There is no such clause. It was in apprehension of that that the persons to whom my hon. friend refers asked that the matter be considered.

Mr. CURRIE: The other section to which objection is taken is that which does away with the advertising of incorporation. Several newspaper proprietors communicated with me on the subject, they wanted to send a deputation.

Mr. A. K. MACLEAN: What do you think about that yourself?

Mr. CURRIE: I think it is a proper thing.

Mr. A. K. MACLEAN: To cut it out?

Mr. CURRIE: No.

Mr. A. K. MACLEAN: What is the good of compelling companies to spend money advertising in newspapers the fact that they have been incorporated?

Mr. CARVELL: If they were compelled to put in only an ordinary notice of eight or ten lines stating that certain gentlemen had been incorporated under the Companies Act, it would not be so bad; but when they have to print columns of material which the average man would not understand if he did read——

Mr. R. B. BENNETT: And which nobody does read.

Mr. CARVELL: I do not think that the newspapers need business so badly as all that.

Mr. CURRIE: That is the ground that the newspaper proprietors are taking, and in justice to them they should be heard. Half a dozen of them have told me that they do not desire any changes to be made in this Act. This Bill proposes to do away almost entirely with the present method of incorporating companies and to adopt what is known as the Ontario Act. A number of clauses in the Ontario Act, while they may do very well in provincial legislation, should not be incorporated in a Dominion Act. For instance, one clause provides that a list of shareholders must be sent annually to the Government.

Mr. MEIGHEN: That is struck out.

Mr. MIDDLEBRO: Neither names nor amounts are required by this Bill.

Mr. CURRIE: In view of the fact that the public were given to understand that the Bill would not be gone on with, I do not see the necessity for going on with it at this late hour in the session. It is a very important Bill, one that should go before a special committee and be just as carefully considered as the Bank Act. On several occasions since I became a member of this House attempts were made to bring about amendments to the Companies Act, but on each occasion nothing was done. Now it is proposed in the dying hours of the longest session of the longest Parliament that we have had to go on with these important amendments to the Companies Act. I should like the Government to consider whether it is good policy to make these changes. I have not had time to read the Bill, but I have received a dozen letters with regard to it. I have given people the assurance that the Bill would not be gone on with.

Mr. CARVELL: Does the hon. member not realize that this Bill was carefully threshed out in the Senate?

Mr. R. B. BENNETT: For five weeks, off and on.

Mr. MEIGHEN: The newspaper men were all heard.

Mr. CARVELL: A Bill like this is particularly within the province and jurisdiction of the Senate. Some of the best business men in Canada are in the Senate; indeed, we are supposed to have none but good business men in the Senate.

Mr. R. B. BENNETT: Do not look at me.

Mr. CARVELL: I am looking at my hon. friend because I anticipate that he will be there before long. Legislation of this character adopted by the Senate is entitled to careful consideration at our hands. It is in proper accordance with our parliamentary system that the Senate should initiate legislation of this kind. Now that they have dealt with the Bill, I feel almost like accepting it in toto. Any practising lawyer who has any company business realizes that the Companies Act of Canada has been almost hopeless. Ontario has a good Act; some of the western provinces—Alberta, for instance—have up-to-date Acts. In my practice I look upon the Dominion Companies Act as almost obsolete, and for that reason I am very anxious to see this Bill go through.

Mr. MEIGHEN: I may say, for the information of the hon. member for North Simcoe (Mr. Currie) that in view of the tremendous pressure of the legislative programme of this session, I am not surprised if the Minister of Finance was under the impression that he would not likely reach the Bill.

Mr. A. K. MACLEAN: I think the Minister of Finance really had reference to the Bill which I introduced in the House.

Mr. CURRIE: No, to the Companies Act of the Senate.

Mr. A. K. MACLEAN: The Bill I introduced was practically a new Act, and I had arranged with the Minister of Finance to refer it to a special committee. Later on we agreed that it would not be pressed at this session.

Mr. MEIGHEN: There is also a Bill No. U2 of the Senate amending the Companies Act.

Mr. CURRIE: The Bill referred to is this Senate Bill, there is no question about that whatever. There is nothing in the argument of my hon. friend (Mr. Carvell) that the Senate has considered this Bill, when we realize that the Senate, in amending a money Bill, the other day forgot that there was such a thing in history as a fight between the King and Parliament as to who should grant Supply, and caused as great inconvenience thereby. That should prevent us in this House from viewing too seriously the fact that the Senate has been considering this Bill for a long time. There was a time when the Senate left Finance Bills alone. Of recent date, however, the Senate has given itself over to considering that the question of the finances of the country rests entirely upon its shoulders, and a week or ten days ago serious discussion was undertaken in the Senate in regard to Supply, and senators there held the view that the Senate has a perfect right to deal with Supply. They claim that this House has only made a rule dealing with Supply, and they ignore altogether the fact that there was a revolution in England and a change in the constitution which placed the granting of supply in the hands of Parliament. Parliament in England has never given the privilege of granting supply over to the House of Lords, and I am certain this Parliament will not give it over to the Senate. This Bill has been the subject of a great deal of discussion in the Senate. The matter was given considerable publicity in the press. Many of us do not read what the press says about things that happen in the Senate, because we are so much taken up with what we say ourselves. Other hon. members have asked me when the Companies' Bill was to be taken up in the House of Commons. If the Companies' Act is to be seriously dealt with in this House it should go before a special committee, if we want a revision of the Act at all. The Senate has sent a few amendments here which appear to be quite harmless, but the Act they propose is a most drastic change of the Dominion Companies' Act. In view of the fact that the Companies' Act has received a great accession of strength from decisions of the Privy Council and the courts as to jurisdiction, it would be a wise thing for the Secretary of State Department to take up the whole matter during the interval, and at the next session of Parliament introduce some Bill that will be workable and readable. I wish again to protest, because I notice that the advertising clause still remains struck out, and for that reason I think the newspaper proprietors should have been heard before this House. Newspaper proprietors and the public generally have no influence whatever with the Senate, and in that case, what

9 p.m.

is the use in their appearing before a committee of the Senate, unless it is to log-roll and lobby senators into passing Bills to help out leading financiers in the country? Every one knows that the House of Commons is amenable to public opinion; it is a representative body, and for that reason I think a Bill of this kind sent over by the Senate at this late hour of the session should be withdrawn.

On section 69a—registration of mortgages and charges:

Mr. MEIGHEN: I move to amend section 69a by striking out the words "September" and "seventeen" in the second line and substituting therefor the words "January" and "eighteen."

Amendment agreed to.

Mr. R. B. BENNETT: This is a drastic section. The trust deed must be lodged with the Secretary of State. The section says:

> Every mortgage or charge... shall, so far as any security on the company's property or undertaking is thereby conferred, be void against the liquidator and any creditor of the company, unless the prescribed particulars of the mortgage or charge, together with the instrument (if any) by which the mortgage or charge is created or evidenced, are delivered to or received by the Secretary of State of Canada, for registration in manner required by this Act within twenty-one days after the date of its creation, but without prejudice to any contract or obligation for repayment of the money thereby secured; and when a mortgage or charge becomes void under this section the money secured thereby shall immediately become payable.

That is the decision of the House of Lords on that point. Twenty-one days, however, from the date of creation of the mortgage to file the same seems a very short time in this country where enormous distances are to be covered. Does not the Secretary of State think twenty-one days a very short time? I had a case in which it was necessary to register a trust deed in four provinces, and in order to comply with all the laws of the different provinces, it was necessary for me to get a special order of the court, before I got through, because of the difficulty of getting in and out of the land titles and registry offices.

Mr. MEIGHEN: Twenty-one days is the English time, but my hon. friend is quite right. We ought to allow about a week extra on account of our distances.

Mr. R. B. BENNETT: I have in mind thirty days or more. I did not like to suggest more than thirty days because the minister might regard it as too long. If you take a trust deed that affects a company like the Canada Cement Company which carries on operations in Manitoba, Alberta, Quebec, and Ontario—and I think it had some property at one time in British Columbia—it takes a great deal of time to register such a trust deed.

Mr. MEIGHEN: I move that the words "twenty-one" be struck out of line 6 of section 69 A on page 16, and the word "thirty" be substituted therefor.

Mr. CARVELL: I have not read this clause carefully, but unless there is some provision by which duplicates could be used, even thirty days is not enough. Take a trust mortgage involving, as very often happens, land in four or five different counties or even provinces. Under our system of registration in the Maritime Provinces, where we have no Torrens system such as exists in the West, every document must be registered and copied out at full length in the registry office.

A trust mortgage of twenty or thirty pages of typewritten matter, as would ordinarily be the case, could not be registered in three out of four of the registry offices in the Maritime Provinces without causing delay too long for this period of thirty days. But if duplicates or triplicates could be used, the difficulty would be overcome.

Mr. R. B. BENNETT: In all the trust deeds now created the provision is made, usually in the last paragraph, that duplicates may be used as originals. I am a little doubtful whether or not the language should not be made a little clearer by inserting in line three, after the word "with," the words "an original of." The very point my hon. friend from Carleton has just mentioned, occurred to me just as he got on his feet.

Amendment agreed to.

Mr. MEIGHEN: I beg to move:

> That in line 3 of page 16, after the word "with" there be inserted the words "an original of."

Mr. CARVELL: I think that is a good suggestion.

Mr. R. B. BENNETT: There is great value attaching to this, because it enables those desiring to know what obligations are outstanding, to apply to the Secretary of State and get the information for the whole of Canada

Amendment agreed to.

Mr. MEIGHEN: I beg to move:

That the word "twenty-one" in lines 19 and 23 of page 16 be struck out and the word "thirty" substituted therefor. Also that in line 41 of the same page the word "September" be struck out and the word "January" substituted therefor; and that in line 42 of the same page the word "seventeen" be struck out and the word "eighteen" substituted therefor.

Amendment agreed to.

Mr. MEIGHEN: I beg to move:

That the word "seven" in line 35 of page 18 be struck out and the word "fourteen" substituted therefor.

Amendment agreed to.

Mr. A. K. MACLEAN: Referring to page 17, subsection 4. We have no provision in the Canada Companies Act with reference to allowing commissions or discounts, but there is such provision in the English Act. It permits a company to pay a commission to any person in consideration of his subscribing or agreeing to subscribe, whether absolutely or conditionally. Of course you could sell mortgage bonds at a discount, and you might always be able to sell debenture shares at a discount.

Mr. MEIGHEN: I believe there is a corresponding provision in our Act.

Mr. R. B. BENNETT: We use in some instances the word "bonds," and in others the word "debentures." "Bond," of course, is not as common a word in England as it is here. In the United States the word "bond" is used in preference to the word "debenture." I do not think we should get away entirely from the use of that word "bond."

Mr. A. K. MACLEAN: The interpretation clause includes "bonds."

Mr. MEIGHEN: A commission may be paid on all bonds and debentures, but not on shares.

Mr. A. K. MACLEAN: Have we a section in our Act permitting the sale of shares below par?

Mr. MEIGHEN: This does not refer to shares, but to bonds or debentures.

Mr. CURRIE: If this clause passes, the underwriting agreements for the taking of bonds would have to be filed with the provincial secretary, and I do not think the banks would approve of that. Such information has never been disclosed in any country in the world.

Mr. MEIGHEN: I understand that the Bankers' Association have thoroughly scrutinized this clause, and have no objection to it.

Mr. CURRIE: Is there a Companies Act in Canada or anywhere else which compels one to disclose the amount of commission paid on the sale of debentures or bonds?

Mr. MEIGHEN: There is such a provision in the English Act, and in the British Columbia Act.

On section 69C—Filing of accounts of receivers and managers:

Mr. R. B. BENNETT: This subsection runs concurrently to some extent with the provisions of the law relating to the receivers or officers of the courts. The receivers, being officers of the courts, have to account, of course, to the courts for the receivership. It would seem to me that all the Secretary of State might reasonably ask would be the filing with him of all such accounts as were regarded as necessary by the courts of the province in which the receivership was taking place. I do not think we should put them to the expense of doing too much of that sort of thing.

Mr. MEIGHEN: This receiver stands in the position that the debenture holder does; he is not a liquidator appointed by the court at all.

Mr. R. B. BENNETT: I had occasion only once in my life to work out the provisions of the law in a case in which the debenture holders took possession. It was under an English trust deed. We did not have a liquidator—only a receiver—and the receiver was an officer of the court. He had to file his accounts.

Mr. MEIGHEN: That is if he is appointed by the court.

Mr. R. B. BENNETT: No, but he took possession for the debenture holders, and under the trust deed he had to go to the court to put himself in propor position. No one would have thought of trying to follow the provisions of the trust deed without going to the court. If he had done so he would have found himself up against all kinds of difficulties and no one would have paid any attention to him. However, I am not going to raise any difficulty about the filing of reports because I think they should be filed.

Mr. MEIGHEN: I do not think this would obviate the necessity under the present law of filing the reports with the court, but when a record of all encumbrances against the company is kept by the

Secretary of State's office, there should also, analogous to the practice in the registry offices, be a record of satisfaction.

Mr. R. B. BENNETT: Section 60D seems to give recognition to the court of the province. The court comes in there and the Secretary of State has power to order the making of an entry of satisfaction under section 69E. Under that section you have to have it done every six months, whereas it would seem that it would be amply sufficient if such report were made at the termination of the receivership or when the entry of satisfaction was put in. It does not make any difference but it is putting them to needless expense. However, it is not a matter that is vital.

On section 69G—Penalties:

Mr. CARVELL: This does not invalidate the deed but it simply provides a penalty for officials failing to register these instruments.

Mr. R. B. BENNETT: The other section did that.

Mr. A. K. MACLEAN: This penalty is very much in contrast with the penalty provided in the reduction-of-capital clauses.

Mr. CARVELL: Two hundred dollars a day is quite a penalty.

Mr. A. K. MACLEAN: I think that the penalty provided for by the reduction-of-capital clauses ought to be reduced. You ought to keep them uniform.

Mr. MEIGHEN: This is not so serious as the other offence; there is very great disparity between them.

Mr. A. K. MACLEAN: The penalty should be very much lower than $200 a day. What is the penalty in the English Act?

Mr. MEIGHEN: I do not recall the penalty in this case but I do in the other. Where we provide a five years' punishment they simply make it a misdemeanour and do not provide a punishment at all. Ours, of course, is simply the maximum. Here is the English Act that corresponds with this law and it provides that any person upon conviction shall be liable to a penalty not exceeding £50 for every day during which default continues.

Mr. R. B. BENNETT: All these sections refer to debentures. As a matter of fact we only issue debentures in this country once in a blue moon.

Mr. A. K. MACLEAN: "Debentures" includes bonds.

Mr. R. B. BENNETT: Where is the definition of that?

Mr. A. K. MACLEAN: It is not in the Bill.

Mr. R. B. BENNETT: That is the point I am raising.

Mr. A. K. MACLEAN: It is in the Provincial Companies Act.

Mr. MIDDLEBRO: What is the difference?

Mr. R. B. BENNETT: There is a very great difference between a debenture and a bond. Speaking generally, used in the sense in which it is used here, a debenture very often means something unsecured by a specific instrument.

Mr. MIDDLEBRO: It all depends on the document itself.

Mr. R. B. BENNETT: Certainly. You can have debenture and a bond. On the American continent the word "bond" is usually used to mark a security that is emitted by a company and secured by a trust deed and mortgage on property.

Mr. A. K. MACLEAN: As a matter of fact they are practically one.

Mr. R. B. BENNETT: But if you are going to sell them in New York a five per cent gold bond is the word they use. Go down there and talk about selling a debenture and they at once think you are dealing with an English security. We must not pass a Bill that is going to preclude us from using the word "bond."

Mr. A. K. MACLEAN: We can fix that by amending the interpretation clause. Say: "Debenture" includes "debenture stock and bonds."

Mr. MEIGHEN: Section 69 of the Act authorizes the issue of bonds, debentures or other securities.

Mr. R. B. BENNETT: All these sections deal with a security called a "debenture" as if it were the only class of security that might be emitted by a corporation secured under the provisions of a trust deed. It would be fatal to the administration of the Act, having regard to what we have to call our securities for the purpose of marketing them, probably, in the United States, if we insisted upon the use of the word "debenture" instead of the word "bond" with which they are familiar in that country. They use the words "municipal debenture" and they also use the word "bond" with respect to industrial and other securi-

ties. They also use the term "debenture stock" with respect to securities issued by railway companies under certain conditions as distinguished from debentures as used with relation to English securities, the English word being always "debentures" and ours "bonds." As long as the Under Secretary of State satisfies the minister that the use of the word "bond" has not been disparaged by this legislation I am satisfied.

Mr. MEIGHEN: That might be amended by adding the word "bonds" to 69a near the bottom of page 15.

Mr. A. K. MACLEAN: No, to paragraph 2f.

Mr. MEIGHEN: Yes, but my hon. friend (Mr. Bennett) refers to its special application to the provisions which are added to section 69 of the present Act. Section 69 of the present Act provides for the issue of bonds and debentures. The point raised by the hon. member for Calgary is that the Bill ought to use the words "bonds and debentures" throughout.

Mr. R. B. BENNETT: I am referring to it as touching on these specific sections only; they limit it to the word "debentures."

Mr. A. K. MACLEAN: I think it would be most important to use both words, "bonds and debentures," or "bonds or debentures." You could add another clause to the interpretation clause.

Mr. MEIGHEN: We have no interpretation clause in this Bill. That is in the main Act.

Mr. A. K. MACLEAN: It is in the main Act, but it would apply to this.

Mr. MEIGHEN: We could, of course, add a new clause amending the interpretation clause of the old Act.

Mr. A. K. MACLEAN: We might add to the interpretation clause of the old Act a sub-clause (h) "debenture includes debentures, debenture stock and bonds."

Mr. MEIGHEN: Is that not the definition in the old Act?

Mr. A. K. MACLEAN: There is no definition; otherwise the objection of the hon. member for Calgary (Mr. R. B. Bennett) would not be substantial.

Mr. MIDDLEBRO: You claim there is a difference between "bond" and "debenture"?

[Mr. R. B. Bennett.]

Mr. R. B. BENNETT: In some particulars. "Debenture" we say should include "bond."

Mr. MIDDLEBRO: There is a definition in the Companies Act, and if you amend this it might change the meaning of other parts of the original Companies Act.

Mr. MEIGHEN: I had occasion to go into this question of the difference between bonds and debentures about four years ago, and I came to the conclusion that while, geographically, there is a difference in the ordinary understanding of the words, the term "debenture" is founded more on the note without specific security, while "bond" is founded on the notion of the basic specific security on which it rests. But I cannot see how a court could distinguish between them now.

Mr. R. B. BENNETT: And yet the character of the instrument must at all times determine the character of the security based upon it. The word "bond" is based on the old assumption that the individual was by this bond bound, and the bond was based on a specific security. The debenture originally had no security necessarily behind it, and hence you have no security specifically charged. You frequently had the use of the words "municipal debenture," being a charge on all the property of the municipality without specifically describing it as such, and you frequently got the word "debenture" referring to a floating charge more accurately than "bond." Without going into the historic side or attempting to define the exact difference between them at common law—and there are decisions in the Court of Appeal and one in the House of Lords—the real fact is that the words "bond" and "debenture" have become more or less interchangeable in use. In America they prefer to use the word "bond" with respect to securities that are emitted by a company secured by a specific charge or mortgage in trust upon its property, together with a floating charge; and "debenture stock" has the attributes of a bond or debenture and in addition to that, certain voting powers in the event of certain contingencies arising. Hence it is that the four per cent perpetual debenture stock of the Canadian Pacific railway may, under certain conditions, exercise voting power.

Mr. A. K. MACLEAN: That is like a deed.

Mr. R. B. BENNETT: That is the specific attribute of debenture stock, and that is why "stock" is different from "debenture," because "stock" implies exercise of voting power, and common stock or common shares carry with them always voting power.

Mr. A. K. MACLEAN: In certain events.

Mr. R. B. BENNETT: Always, unless there be certain limitations placed upon a certain class of shares such as Bethlehem Steel the other day. The word "stock" implies a power to vote and assist in the control of the enterprise; "debenture stock" means a security with the attributes of a debenture plus the right, under certain conditions, to exercise voting power and thereby control the corporation. But to eliminate the use of the word "bond" in this country would be destructive of the very purpose for which this Act is being framed; for if I undertook to create in a trust deed purely debentures and never had the right to create bonds, I am satisfied that, with respect to certain enterprises with which I am quite familiar, you would have exceeding difficulty dealing with them, and especially if you were issuing, say three series of bonds. I have in mind two companies both of which have issued three series of bonds as authorized under trust deeds. The issues may be up to $3,000,000. They have exercised the power to issue to the extent of three-quarters of a million dollars under series A, three quarters of a million dollars under series B and three quarters of a million dollars under series C. If we come in and pass this Act and call these securities "debentures," and debentures only, we shall bring about a state of affairs that I think the law officers would say would not be what was intended. Rather I think that "bond" and "debenture" should be synonymous, "debenture" being the English term and "bond" being ours.

Mr. CURRIE: Mr. Chairman, I wish to draw your attention to the fact that there is no quorum.

Mr. REID: There is a quorum.

The CHAIRMAN: There is a quorum, twenty-three or twenty-four.

Mr. A. K. MACLEAN: I have sent over a suggested amendment to the Secretary of State.

Mr. MEIGHEN: Perhaps we could return to sub-clause 2 and add that there be added thereto the following as sub-section (h), "'debenture' includes bonds."

Mr. A. K. MACLEAN: "'Debenture' includes debenture stock and bonds."

Mr. R. B. BENNETT: "'Debenture' includes debenture, debenture stock, and bonds."

On section 69 K—Payments of certain debts out of assets subject to floating charge in priority to claims under the charge:

Mr. R. B. BENNETT: This gives preference claims the right to be paid out of floating charge property; that is those having prior claim in point of law, wages and, under certain conditions, rent.

Mr. MACDONALD: The language is rather peculiar "the debts which in every winding-up." There ought to be some more definite indication that this refers to wages or rent.

Mr. MEIGHEN: One would think it should be just "in winding-up." I am inclined to agree with my hon. friend. The British Act used the words "every winding-up."

Mr. A. K. MACLEAN: What is wrong with it?

Mr. MEIGHEN: It does not seem good drafting.

Mr. MACDONALD: In England, there are questions of winding up, but they have only one jurisdiction there. Here it might be urged that the Act is broad enough to cover any provincial winding-up act. It is intended to avoid litigation.

Mr. CARVELL: We would have no jurisdiction to interfere with provincial legislation or a provincial company.

Mr. R. B. BENNETT: Unfortunately we have power to interfere with provincial companies. The courts have held—and the decisions have been sustained—that a liquidator under the Winding-up Act cannot bring an action except with the consent of the court, and the court must be the one where the original order was granted. I had to come to Ontario to get a right to sue in a winding-up proceeding which was started out West.

Mr. MEIGHEN: It seems to me we cover the case by striking out the word "every" in line 34.

Subsection amended and agreed to.

On section 10—Restrictions on appointment or advertisement of director:

Mr. MACDONALD: What is the theory at the base of this proposition? You have

a prospectus issued with provisional directors, and you preclude their appointment, except under certain conditions. What is the genesis of that proposal? I should think there would be no necessity for it.

Mr. R. B. BENNETT: Yes, men's names have appeared upon prospectuses when these men were not really directors, and this is to obviate the possibility of any difficulty of that kind. The consent must be filed in the minister's office.

Mr. MACDONALD: This does not appear to be taken from the English Act.

Mr. MEIGHEN: Yes, it is the Imperial Act.

Mr. CARVELL: Does this change the method, so common in many portions of Canada at the present time, of organizing a company out of the stenographers in an office?

Mr. MEIGHEN: That is the purpose of this section, combined with the former section.

Mr. CARVELL: That is what I thought, and I think the provision is very salutary one. I think it is a mistake to allow people to form joint stock companies with purely fictitious directors.

Mr. A. K. MACLEAN: That is not the reason of this section.

Mr. CARVELL: I think any body of men forming a joint stock company and receiving the legal right to become an entity should come out in the open; the people would know who they are.

Mr. MEIGHEN: This section follows on to be consistent with the previous section which prevents the well known practice of forming companies out of stenographers, or stool-pigeons of one kind or other, and then holding out to the country in the prospectus, that some eminent man is to be director.

Mr. CARVELL: That is it.

Mr. MEIGHEN: Unless he is named in the first place, and his consent filed, that cannot be done.

Mr. A. K. MACLEAN: Under the English Companies Act, you can incorporate with the office clerks, but they have provisional directors only, and the Act makes provision for that. We have no such provision. I do not see how it would prevent the arrangement which the hon. gentleman from Carleton hoped it would prevent.

Mr. R. B. BENNETT: Yes, it will.

[Mr. Macdonald.]

Mr. CARVELL: Take this in connection with the previous section.

Mr. MACDONALD: To what section does the hon. gentleman refer?

Mr. MEIGHEN: On page 6, section 43, 43A, 43B, 43C, 43D.

Mr. A. K. MACLEAN: That is only when you propose issuing a prospectus.

Mr. MEIGHEN: The hon. gentleman suggests it may be done when there is no prospectus issued?

Mr. A. K. MACLEAN: Yes, it would be a good provision to enact that, before any person can be named as director in a prospectus, his name must be filed, but I do not see how it would prevent the organization of a company with a provisional board of directors by the use of office hands, and I do not know that it is desirable to prevent that. That is not the object of the section.

Mr. MEIGHEN: If the office hands have the stock, and there is no appeal to the public by prospectus, nobody requires to be protected.

Mr. CARVELL: There is no objection if there is no prospectus issued to the public. I think this is a proper section, coupled with section 43B, because the damage is not done by the ordinary small business corporation that is being created and which is not issuing a prospectus, but by the flotation of the big companies which start out with flaming headlines. I think these provisions are all right.

Mr. MEIGHEN: I move that after the word "prospectus" in line 10 section 10, the words "or in any notice in lieu of prospectus" be added.

Mr. A. K. MACLEAN: Where did subsection 2 of section 10 come from? Is it original?

Mr. MEIGHEN: It is out of the English Act. In fact the whole section is practically word for word with the English Act.

Mr. MACDONALD: The result of these combined sections is that the practice of a solicitor putting his stenographers in as provisional applicants is done away with.

Mr. MEIGHEN: This provision prevents a company from offering for sale shares, debentures, or bonds, while pretending to the public that certain parties are directors when as a matter of fact they are not bona fide directors. It does not go so far as to say that a company may not be composed

of certain persons named as provisional directors, when, as a matter of fact, the permanent directors are well known to be others entirely. That could be done so long as there was not an appeal to the public.

On section 92—investigation of affairs of company:

Mr. MEIGHEN: I move that the word "warranting," in line 33, page 22, be struck out and that the following be substituted therefor: "as in the opinion of the Secretary of State of Canada warrants," and that the words "in the opinion of the Secretary of State of Canada" be inserted after the words "members as," in line 37.

Amendment agreed to.

On section 94a—appointment and remuneration of auditors.

Mr. A. K. MACLEAN: If the company fails to appoint an auditor at its annual general meeting, why should not the directors have the power to appoint, rather than the Secretary of State?

Mr. MEIGHEN: The auditor is primarily to be elected by the shareholders. If the shareholders omit to elect an auditor it would appear to me to be better to leave it to the Secretary of State than to the board of directors.

Mr. CARVELL: Auditors are appointed by the shareholders, not by the Government.

On section 94b—powers and duties of auditors:

Mr. MEIGHEN: This is copied word for word from the British Act.

Mr. A. K. MACLEAN: This provision will not apply to private companies?

Mr. MEIGHEN: Yes, this provision applies to private companies.

On section 105—Annual meeting.

Mr. R. B. BENNETT: The balance sheet provision is entirely too cumbersome and exacting in its demands for any other than a public company of some magnitude. It is entirely too much to ask small companies in remote communities or small companies with a few shareholders in large cities, incorporated under this Act, to give all the information required in this balance sheet. The trouble is that the provision will be disobeyed. It is too much to ask companies that have a capital of $100,000 and perhaps six shareholders to go through all this formality and prepare a balance sheet with all these details. Auditors are not accustomed to preparing a statement containing all that information. During the last few hours I have been reading the report of the Canadian Locomotive Company, and its balance sheet, published in a newspaper, contains a very clear statement of assets and liabilities, and it gives the report to the shareholders certified by the auditors, indicating the profits, depreciation account and matters of that kind. Under clause (j) of subsection 2 of this section, the balance sheet must show the amount of common shares, subscribed for and allotted and the amount paid thereon, showing the amount thereof allotted for services rendered, for commissions or for assets acquired. After a company is once launched, who has any interest in those things? The people who have succeeded to the company may not know anything about these matters. The Secretary of State has all this information before him on the incorporation of the company. I have in mind a statement I saw from one of the largest companies of Canada the other day in response to an inquiry addressed to it. The statement was that the present officers had no such knowledge. What abuse is sought to be remedied, as against an auditor's certificate?

Mr. MEIGHEN: First of all, these very provisions have been in operation in Ontario for some ten years, I understand, with very considerable satisfaction.

Mr. R. B. BENNETT: I am told that they are more honoured in the breach than in the observance by small companies.

Mr. MEIGHEN: I have not that information. Furthermore, they are as recommended by the Institute of Accountants for Ontario.

Mr. A. K. MACLEAN: There is no doubt about that.

Mr. R. B. BENNETT: I have no doubt as to that or that they would be recommended by any other Institute of Accountants that my hon. friend will ever hear of.

Mr. MEIGHEN: I presume they are just as anxious for detail work as anybody else. At the same time, there is nothing impracticable in this, or they would not want to do what they could not get done. Each provision was threshed out with great care, and, in particular, the clause to which my hon. friend referred.

Mr. R. B. BENNETT: What good is it going to do, for instance, in the third annual report of the company?

Mr. MEIGHEN: It is not impossible that between the second and third annual reports of the company shares might have been sold for just such a consideration as is stated in the clause. One of
10 p.m. the objects of the amendments to the British and Ontario Acts which we endeavoured to embody in our Companies Act by this Bill is to provide for full disclosure and publicity with regard to all shares allotted for services rendered, for the purchase of assets and so on, in order that every one connected with the company may know where the shares of the company are going and what they are going for.

Mr. R. B. BENNETT: That is right, too.

Mr. MEIGHEN: It is not impossible that between the second and third annual report of the company there should be shares allotted for services rendered.

Mr. R. B. BENNETT: The directors could not do that.

Mr. MEIGHEN: I have seen it done.

Mr. R. B. BENNETT: Under the Dominion Act, I would not like to see it done.

Mr. MEIGHEN: I have understood it to be the law that it could be done.

Mr. R. B. BENNETT: Not unless it is approved by the shareholders.

Mr. A. K. MACLEAN: In what province did the minister see it done?

Mr. MEIGHEN: In Manitoba.

Mr. A. K. MACLEAN: It would be a very risky thing to do.

Mr. MEIGHEN: It is evidently the opinion of the framers of this measure that it can be done, because this clause applies to companies already formed.

Mr. R. B. BENNETT: That is the real objection to it.

Mr. MEIGHEN: Why should not a company already formed be compelled to make disclosure of these facts?

Mr. R. B. BENNETT. This is what I call the impertinent side of the inquiries of departments. A company is launched, shares are sold and have been in the hands of the public for ten years. Now because a very well-deserving department desire to pry into the way in which a company has carried on its business since its inception, they make a provision that a class of men who may know nothing about the matter must dig into the past history of the company in order to supply the department with the information. What purpose does that serve? I have in mind a company about which there was much controversy and difficulty. The directors are asked to lay before the department a statement covering matters that occurred seven, eight, nine or ten years ago, and some of the books may not be in order as they once were. I saw a report of one of the biggest firms in Canada saying: We have no longer the custody of the books, and we cannot give this information. If it is determined that all this information must be given—and to that I see no objection—provision should be made that the information is to be given as from the date of the last report. Is this department suddenly seized with such a zeal for the public interest that, after letting ten years go by without any such legislation to prevent this being done, it is now going back ten years in order to find out what was done?

Mr. MEIGHEN: This is for the shareholders and not for the public.

Mr. R. B. BENNETT: It has to be communicated to the shareholders in so far as they desire, and under such conditions that means the widest publicity. We need not mention names, but there is a company that has been the subject matter of much discussion in this Parliament, so that we know what we are speaking about. Information is requested as to the issue of common shares and securities. These are matters long since forgotten. Why in 1917, should the department be zealous to have this information disclosed in a report when it was all known when the company was incorporated? If you say "since the date of the last annual report" I am in entire accord with what the minister says, as this makes a new departure.

Mr. MEIGHEN: If that is added to clause (j), it should also be added to clause (k).

Mr. R. B. BENNETT: Certainly.

Mr. CARVELL: In regard to clause (j), my hon. friend speaks of the small companies with $100,000 capital. There is not much stock given away in promoting a company of that kind, because that is usually a partnership of a few people who organize themselves into a company. I do not think there will be more than one case in a hundred where any hardship will be worked. I do not see any reason why you should not give the amount of the preferred shares and all the other information.

Mr. A. K. MACLEAN: Having been given once, that should be sufficient.

Mr. CARVELL: Yes, but we are branching out on entirely new lines in Canada. A great many things will happen in this country within the next ten years that never happened before. We have had a business profits tax for the first time in our history, and now we have the income tax. It is these incorporated companies who are the very ones that will contribute under these new methods of taxation, and I think it quite proper that the very fullest publicity should be given. I think the department should have power, if necessary, to investigate right from the very beginning, and see on how much actual stock the company should be allowed to pay dividends; in other words, it is getting after the watered stock.

Mr. R. B. BENNETT: It is too late after it has been sold to the public.

Mr. CARVELL: It is being worked out in Ontario, and they have had no difficulty there. It would be a good thing for all companies if they kept such a record as this provides for. I have in my mind a fairly small company in which I happen to be a stockholder and a director. It was practically a partnership organized in the form of a joint stock company. We went on year after year without a proper set of books, although the books we had told us what we were spending, how much we were taking in, and what our net profit was. But when I came to make out the statement required under the Business Profits Tax Act, I found that our balance sheet was entirely deceptive, and I could not ask the department to rely upon it. I think a great many people in Canada found themselves in the same position.

Mr. R. B. BENNETT: You probably had no certificated auditor.

Mr. CARVELL: We have auditors sufficient for our purpose. We were not the Lake of the Woods Milling Company, or anything of that kind, but we were handling a fair amount of money every year, and I am happy to say were earning good dividends. As I was saying, our books told us exactly what we were making, but when I came to make up the statement in connection with the business profits tax, the statement was not logical at all and required a good deal of explaining and amending. I am in favour of this provision, although I realize that many of the conditions will be onerous to small corporations.

Mr. R. B. BENNETT: Surely my hon. friend would not desire to make paragraphs (j) and (k) retroactive.

Mr. CARVELL: I am not at all particular about it.

Mr. R. B. BENNETT: I have in my mind another company, which I think would have some difficulty in supplying the information. But assuming that they could. I do not see why Parliament, starting on this new departure, should make the provisions retroactive, because it would in many instances affect people who are no longer shareholders in the enterprise. It would simply mean that information would be furnished that would not advance the public interest in the least. Once the shares are listed and sold, once you can buy and sell them on the open exchange, the questions that (j) and (k) deal with cease to have any public interest and become matters only of private concern. I think my hon. friend will agree with that.

Mr. CARVELL: I do.

Mr. R. B. BENNETT: There is another point which I mentioned to my hon. friend from Perth a few moments ago. Paragraph (e) deals with "expenditures made on account of future business." Now that is a direct invitation to a statement that is incorrect. It is one of the most deceptive things that could possibly be put in a balance sheet. It would include such things as advertising, sending men out and appropriating $20,000 for this, that, or the other thing. Then paragraph (g) deals with "goodwill, franchises, patents and copyrights, trademarks, leases, contracts and licenses." Goodwill, franchises, patents, copyrights and trademarks, are usually carried in balance sheets at a nominal figure or else at a figure that is being constantly reduced. The figure is often introduced in the balance sheet originally for the purpose of enabling watered stock to be taken care of. The Ogilvies' figures on this account now stands at one dollar, and has done so for the last five years. In another company the figure has been reduced from 800,000 to 650,000 in three years. I cannot quite follow what is in the mind of the Government in dealing with leases and contracts in this paragraph. I also submit that paragraphs (j) and (k) should be limited to information since the last balance sheet.

Mr. A. K. MACLEAN: I rather agree with the hon. member for Calgary when he says that we should make these requirements as simple as possible. In the first place, we must recognize the fact that very few companies in Canada are administered strictly according to law. Corporations in this country are very loosely administered, and it is almost impossible for it to be otherwise unless the company has the constant services of a legal advisor—

Mr. R. B. BENNETT: And a highly skilled chartered accountant.

Mr. A. K. MACLEAN: —in order to see that the requirements of the law are complied with. In England some men make a profession of acting as secretary to companies. One man will be secretary to twenty or a hundred, or, perhaps, two hundred companies. He gets accustomed to the legal requirements and carries the companies through all their troubles. The difficulty in Canada is that our minor corporations, not the larger ones, do not pretend to comply strictly with the law. I think the simpler we make this the better. The majority of companies incorporated under this Act could not understand subsection 105 if the directors and officers were all laymen. I like the idea of the section, but I think it would be better, at the beginning, to make it quite simple and let it grow up. I think the objection of the hon. member for Calgary to sections (j) and (k) is substantial. We should not require a company to continue year after year to include in their statement the fact that at the inception of their business so many shares were issued against services, or against property. If that is done once I think it should be sufficient.

Mr. MEIGHEN: I am prepared to accept that suggestion. I wish to make clear that this is no attempt on the part of the State Department to pry into the affairs of companies. On the contrary, the officials of the department would be very glad to be relieved of this duty. The Senate, however, insists very strongly on these two clauses remaining exactly as they are. I beg to move:

That at the end of paragraphs (j) and (k) there be added the words "since the last annual meeting."

Mr. A. K. MACLEAN: I think that is the way it is in the English Act.

Mr. R. B. BENNETT: Yes. I did not mean that the State Department was being unnecessarily given to inquiries, but only that that would be the proper designation, this should not be kept on for years. It was not a personal application to any individual.

Mr. MORPHY: I would like the Secretary of State to distinguish the words "classes and assets and liabilities" in subsection 3. Here it is put cumulatively but it seems to me that it would be more intelligent if the word "and" were changed to "of."

Mr. R. B. BENNETT: That should be "of."

Mr. MEIGHEN: I think it should be "or."

Mr. A. K. MACLEAN: Does the Secretary of State propose providing these forms which will be for sale?

Mr. MEIGHEN: I would presume so. The forms which we purpose providing for under section 105 are for the purpose of affording information not to the department but to the shareholders, and doubtless they would do that themselves.

Mr. A. K. MACLEAN: Is there any penalty in connection with section 105?

Mr. MEIGHEN: No.

Mr. CARVELL: Section 113 provides a penalty.

Mr. MACDONALD: What happens supposing the balance sheet is not presented?

Mr. R. B. BENNETT: There is a provision by which the charter is lost if they do not do certain things within a certain number of years.

Mr. MEIGHEN: Inasmuch as these provisions are obligatory on the company, a shareholder can take proceedings to enforce their observance. I would direct the attention of the committee to section 113 which provides that:

Every one who, being a director, manager or officer of a company, or acting on its behalf, commits any act contrary to the provisions of this Act, or fails or neglects to comply with any such provision, shall, if no penalty for such act, failure or neglect is expressly provided by this Act, be liable, on summary conviction, to a penalty of not more than one thousand dollars, or to imprisonment for not more than one year, or to both such penalty and imprisonment.

Mr. A. K. MACLEAN: Where does that section hail from? Is it made in Ottawa?

Mr. MEIGHEN: It has no parentage at all; it is new.

Mr. A. K. MACLEAN: I think that is a pretty dangerous provision.

Mr. MEIGHEN: We have not come to it yet.

On section 13—annual returns:

Mr. MEIGHEN: We provide the forms there.

Mr. MIDDLEBRO: I observe that you have not adopted the provision of the Ontario Act which requires a return as to the name of each shareholder of the company and the amount of the shares unpaid.

Mr. MEIGHEN: That was in originally but was struck out. It entailed a tremendous amount of work and is easily evaded. All the company has to do is to syndicate its shares in the name of a trustee. They will do that to avoid the trouble of making such a return.

Mr. MIDDLEBRO: That has not been the experience in Ontario.

Mr. MEIGHEN: But you have not as large companies as we have here.

Mr. MIDDLEBRO: We have some of the largest companies in Canada.

Mr. R. B. BENNETT: Not incorporated under the Companies Act of Ontario?

Mr. MIDDLEBRO: Yes.

Mr. R. B. BENNETT: Most of them have taken Dominion charters under this new Act.

Mr. MIDDLEBRO: I suppose fifteen or twenty times a year my office writes down to the provincial secretary's office for the names of shareholders in different companies. That assists us in the way of executions and services. How are we to get that information if we cannot get it in that way? It is not a good reason to say that it is too much work for the company. It is a safeguard for the public, and we are legislating in the public interest.

Mr. A. K. MACLEAN: Why should you know if I own a share in a company any more than you should know whether my wife had purchased a new hat during the last sixty days?

Mr. CARVELL: What the public is interested in is the company and not the men who happen to own the individual shares in the company. In New Brunswick the shares of a company are not taxable. If I own a dozen shares in a company I do not pay any taxes on them; the taxes are paid by the company itself. The public wants to know how much the company's assets and dividends are. If it be a public utility company it wants to know that it is not earning more money than it ought to earn, and we treat it as a corporation and not as a number of individuals.

Mr. MIDDLEBRO: I was not referring to the question of taxation but to the question of executions and the recovery of debts from men who hold shares in companies. There is no way of ascertaining what they do hold except by an examination for discovery. There must be a very good reason for not requiring this information to be filed.

Mr. R. B. BENNETT: With reference to local companies the reason is very clear, but with reference to a Dominion company there must be the greatest possible measure of protection not inconsistent with some reasonable measure of domestic secrecy in the transaction of its affairs. It will be observed that by section 106 we make provision for every matter of interest to the public with respect to the company itself. The point mentioned by my hon. friend from North Grey (Mr. Middlebro) is not one that the public has much concern in because if you have an execution against a man the chances are that he has no shares standing in his name. If there is an execution against him he is going to get rid of his shares.

Mr. MIDDLEBRO: If he has any shares, under this Act he does not need to get rid of them. He may have a thousand shares in the company and he may not have half of them paid for. Unless I can find out what shares he has and what he has paid I do not know what interest he has in those shares. I cannot find out from the return how much is paid up or what interest he has in the shares of the company.

Mr. A. K. MACLEAN: Can you not examine him?

Mr. MIDDLEBRO: That means commencing an action, and after the action is commenced you may find that only ten per cent has been paid on the shares. As it is now I write to the provincial secretary and he sends me all this information.

Mr. A. K. MACLEAN: With five thousand shareholders that would be a serious obligation on the company.

Mr. MIDDLEBRO: No, they could have a printed list as in the case of the Canadian Pacific railway.

Mr. MEIGHEN: I do not think the object is consistent at all. We should not say that a company should supply this information in order that a judgment credi-

tor chasing a debtor may find out whether the debtor has anything worth suing for. The creditor may ascertain that by a motion for discovery against the debtor. There are three reasons for striking it out; first, to avoid unnecessary disclosure; second, to avoid a great deal of work; and third, because it is the most easily evaded of all requirements. I wish to move to add at the end of paragraph (i) the words "since the last annual return".

Mr. R. B. BENNETT: "Since the last annual meeting".

Mr. MEIGHEN: I presume if one says "since the last annual return", if there had been no return previously it would be right from the beginning.

Mr. A. K. MACLEAN: I think "return" is better.

Mr. R. B. BENNETT: No, because then you have to start at the beginning of things. You require a return of the total amount paid by way of commission in respect of any shares, bonds or debentures or allowed by way of discount in respect of any bonds or debentures. That starts the whole history of the enterprise. It is retroactive legislation going back perhaps twenty years. The next provision, the number of shares forfeited, is also retroactive.

Mr. MEIGHEN: Would the interpretation not be that on the first call, as no annual return has been made before, there would be nothing to comply with under paragraph (i); but the next time there would be, and then the objection of my hon. friend is overcome.

Mr. R. B. BENNETT: Absolutely. If my hon. friend thinks that is sufficiently clear, it meets the very point I am making.

Mr. GLASS: Reverting to section 105, is there anything imposing on the corporation the requirement of having the statement which is laid before the meeting of the shareholders printed and circulated to shareholders who may not be there? It seems to me that all of that information should be available to any shareholders, even if he is living at a distance and unable to be present.

Mr. MEIGHEN: A shareholder can be represented by a proxy who can send him the information. Companies would object to circulating printed statements of their affairs, as it would amount in the end to newspaper advertising.

[Mr. Meighen.]

Mr. GLASS: If a shareholder is unable to be present at a meeting and does not happen to have a proxy, but at some future date desires to see that statement, is it available for him?

Mr. R. B. BENNETT: Yes, at ten cents a hundred words, the exact cost of it.

On section 14—Section 113 amended—Penalties:

Mr. A. K. MACLEAN: It seems to me that the penalty provided by this section is excessive.

Mr. R. B. BENNETT: The penalty of one thousand dollars or imprisonment for one year or both is a maximum. It may be only a dollar.

Mr. A. K. MACLEAN: I should not like to see it within the power of any court to impose such a serious penalty.

Mr. CARVELL: It might be an ordinary country magistrate.

Mr. A. K. MACLEAN: There are many things directors may neglect to do, and they are sometimes not of any importance. The shareholders may not object, as a matter of fact, or, perhaps, none would object, with the exception of one man, who, possibly, may have some personal grievance against one or more directors, and with this weapon in his hand he may make it very disagreeable for them.

Mr. MEIGHEN: There are offences coverable by this section that would be inadequately penalized by a lesser maximum. The hon. senator from Montreal, or from Hochelaga, whom every one will recognize not only as a very eminent lawyer, but a particularly capable man on a Bill of this kind, spoke at great length in the Senate, insisting strongly on the clause.

Mr. A. K. MACLEAN: The fact that we do not find it in any Companies' Act would make one suspicious of it.

Mr. MEIGHEN: We had a corresponding section in our own Act. It is true this is not borrowed from any other Companies' Act.

Mr. A. K. MACLEAN: There are many things which the directors or officers of a company may fail to do without doing any injury to the company, or to any of its shareholders.

Mr. MEIGHEN: I know that.

Mr. R. B. BENNETT: They are covered by the word "wilful," which precedes the

characterization of the offences described in most of these sections, and, therefore, it would have to be wilful to come within that section. It is not in this section, but it appears in most sections dealing with offences.

Mr. CARVELL: About the only section this applies to would be 105 and 106.

Mr. A. K. MACLEAN: You have penalties provided already. Suppose the directors fail to hold the annual meeting, I do not think it should necessarily follow that they should be liable to a penalty of any amount.

Mr. R. B. BENNETT: Why not?

Mr. A. K. MACLEAN: They may have very good reason. They may have been absent from the country. There are scores of provisions in the Companies' Act which are never carried out, and really are not expected to be. They are there more for protective than for practical purposes.

Mr. MORPHY: While I agree, in a measure, with the reading of the section, it looks very much more drastic than it really is. The penalty, on summary conviction, is a fine of not more than $1,000. It might be one, two, or ten dollars. I do not think it makes any difference if you reduce it to four or five hundred dollars. No ordinary magistrate would want to impose more than ten or twenty dollars for a technical offence under the Act. I think that section and the enforcing of it should be at the instance of somebody who is a shareholder in the company. I do not think it is right to put a section of that kind in the statute book which would leave it open to a blackmailer or a man without the shadow of an interest who happened to get the knowledge of some particular omission by a director of a trivial matter in which he had no concern from personal spite to lay a charge, and would compel the magistrate to impose a penalty and costs. I suggest that that section be amended in the 34th line, after the word "Act" by inserting the words "on complaint of a shareholder or other one interested in the company."

Mr. MEIGHEN: Or a person canvassed by an officer of the company?

Mr. MORPHY: A person who is affected by the neglect. There might be no special damages, but there are multifarious things which have to be done, and some of these things might be neglected. This section is very general and broad. It seems more a case for the issue of a fiat by the Minister of Justice or Secretary of State, before a prosecution can be held.

Mr. MEIGHEN: I thought before a conviction was entered the consent of the Secretary of State might be required.

Mr. MORPHY: I am rather opposed to fiats going after complaints are lodged. I believe that before a dollar's worth of expense is incurred under public acts of this kind, the fiat should issue. It is the basis of the complaint.

Mr. GLASS: Might not some one other that a shareholder be prejudiced by the non-performance of some provisions of the Act? A creditor's interests might be just as important as the shareholders.

Mr. MEIGHEN: Yes. Does any one feel the clause is dangerous as it is, or that it would be safeguarded by an amendment to the following effect: "Provided no action shall be entered under this section except with the written consent of the Secretary of State of Canada"?

Mr. MORPHY: No information or complaint should be laid.

Mr. A. K. MACLEAN: Or no proceeding taken.

Mr. R. B. BENNETT: Take the case of the old Eaton Company, which did not have the word "Limited" after it; some enterprising young man started proceedings under which he got half the fines throughout Ontario. I think this section is capable of abuse, and the suggestion of the Secretary of State seems to meet the case, and overcomes the difficulty. My hon. friend to my right (Mr. Morphy) does not think any too much of that suggestion, but I think it the easiest way to meet the difficulty.

Mr. A. K. MACLEAN: I would strike it out altogether.

Mr. BENNETT: Oh, no.

Mr. A. K. MACLEAN: We have penalties for almost everything.

Mr. MEIGHEN: I should not like to strike it out, I will move to add the following words:

Provided no proceeding shall be taken under this section without the consent in writing of the Secretary of State for Canada.

Mr. A. K. MACLEAN: Section 113 is a new one; I do not know that a similar section may be found in any Companies Act. It is a dangerous provision, and I do not think that it should be left in. Why not strike it out? If necessary it could be taken up next year.

Mr. CARVELL: The member for Halifax and myself do not often disagree, but I do think that the provision made by the Secretary of State meets all objections. I cannot conceive of the Secretary of State—I care not whether he is Grit or Tory—sanctioning a prosecution against a company for failure to carry out certain requirements of the law unless there was a real failure; unless some person was substantially injured by the company's neglect.

Amendment agreed to, and section as amended agreed to.

On section 17—Further application of this Act:

Mr. MEIGHEN: I move that at the commencement of this section the following words be added: The sections added or substituted in the principal Act by".

Amendment agreed to.

Mr. A. K. MACLEAN: Should there not be a provision that the Act shall not come into force until January 1, 1918? It is usual in company legislation to fix a future date upon which the Act shall become effective, in order that companies may be given an opportunity to understand its provisions.

Mr. MEIGHEN: It is necessary that the incorporating sections of the Act be available right away. The compulsory clauses of the Act do not take effect immediately in any case.

On section 92—Investigation of affairs of company:

Mr. MEIGHEN: I move that in subsection 1, subclause 2, the word "company" be changed to "corporation", and that the word "company's" in line 37 be changed to "corporation's". A company which has no share capital is called a corporation.

Amendment agreed to.

Mr. A. K. MACLEAN: Would it not be well to have a form in the schedule to the Act for returns?

Mr. MEIGHEN: It is intended to have forms to comply with section 106, but they are not to constitute an appendage to the Act.

Bill as amended reported, amendments read the first and second time and concurred in.

FORBIDDEN CIRCULATION IN CANADA.

"THE FIDDLERS"—STATEMENT BY HON. FRANK OLIVER—AMENDMENT NEGATIVED.

On the motion of Hon. J. D. Reid for Committee of Supply:

[Mr. A. K. Maclean.]

Hon. FRANK OLIVER (Edmonton): Mr. Speaker, before you leave the Chair, I desire to draw the attention of the House to a matter that I brought up some time ago, and I would like to have an opportunity of dealing with it at some little length tonight. It relates to the prohibition of the book called "The Fiddlers." When I brought this matter to the attention of the House on a former occasion, I asked the Government to specify the portion of the book that was in contravention of the Consolidated Orders in Council regarding censorship. It was a very plain and simple question, but I have not yet received an answer to it. Instead of an answer, the House was favoured by the Prime Minister with a statement by Surgeon-General Fotheringham, who made a long report to the Prime Minister, which the Prime Minister presented to the House. The purport of the report was that this book contained reflections upon the conduct of Canadian soldiers, and, therefore, it was undesirable that it should be circulated in Canada. The fact, if it be a fact, that the book is according to the description of Surgeon-General Fotheringham, does not bring it within the censorship regulations, and, therefore, the prohibition of the circulation of the book by order of the Government or the censor is a trespass upon the rights of the people of Canada that should not be committed by its Government. It is to be supposed that, when a Government has the full power to make a law, as it has in the passing of regulations regarding censorship, having made provision for the prohibition of undesirable books or other literature, it should be willing to be bound by law that it itself has made, and that it should not undertake to exercise for the suppression of free speech or of the circulation of literature a power that it does not possess by any authority of any body, not even of itself. I might perhaps read to the House the conclusion of the report by Surgeon-General Fotheringham in regard to this book. He says:

> It is submitted, please, that the above criticisms on the character of the pamphlet in question are fair and represent the general unreliability of the pamphlet as a whole. If I may be permitted to express an opinion based upon my personal knowledge of the situation among the Canadian troops in France and Britain as regards alcoholism and venereal disease it would be that the circulation of statements such as fill the pamphlet in question, among the people of Canada is most undesirable, and should be prevented by any measures open to the authorities, having regard to the interests both of the troops themselves and of the Canadian public.

It will be observed that the Prime Minister does not make that statement. It is made by a gentleman holding a responsible position under the Government; but the Prime Minister takes the responsibility of placing that statement before the House on the authority of this official, and therefore I am compelled to hold the Prime Minister responsible for that statement. The statement is that the Government, owing to the character of this book, is justified in using any measures open to the authorities to prevent its circulation in Canada, and that such prevention would be in the interest both of the troops themselves and of the Canadian public. The attempt is made by Surgeon-General Fotheringham and the Prime Minister to create the impression that this book is printed for the purpose of libelling the Canadian forces in England. There is no such purpose in the book, either directly or indirectly. The book is for the purpose of calling to account the Government of Great Britain for permitting the destruction, in the manufacture of alcohol, of grain required for food, a subject that is surely entitled to be criticised in any free country, a matter of public administration in regard to a matter of grave public interest. That criticism, I am credibly informed, is not subject to prohibition in England, in Great Britain, in the United Kingdom. There the book is freely circulated. But in Canada it is made subject to the censorship. Just to give the House the character of the book, on page 4, under the heading "The Shadow of Famine," the writer says—

11 p.m.

Mr. EDWARDS: I rise to a point of order. Is it competent for the hon. gentleman to quote from a book, the circulation of which has been prohibited in Canada? By placing an extract on Hansard he is circulating the contents of a book which has been prohibited in this country.

Mr. DEPUTY SPEAKER: Without having had an opportunity to consult the authorities, I should say that the point of order is well taken.

Mr. OLIVER: If I may speak to the point of order, I would say that I claim the privilege of Parliament. Under that privilege I claim the right to read this book. I claim there is no prohibition upon the reading of this book by a member of Parliament within the walls of Parliament.

Mr. EDWARDS: If the point of order is well taken, surely the hon. member cannot discuss it.

Mr. GRAHAM: The hon. member has not read anything from this book yet, so far as I have heard, and he cannot be called to order until he has done so.

Mr. A. K. MACLEAN: There can surely be no objection to discussing the point of order. What is the purport of the order of the censor in reference to this book? Does anybody know what his order was? I suppose it was that this book was not to be circulated. But that certainly should not prevent a member of Parliament discussing the book, or the wisdom of the act of the censor. How can the point of order be sustained?

Mr. EDWARDS: I take precisely the same view as the junior member for Halifax (Mr. Maclean). I would say that the hon. member for Edmonton was quite in order in criticising the censoring of this book, and I only rose to a point of order when he undertook to place on Hansard the contents of a book which had been prohibited in this country.

Mr. A. K. MACLEAN: This prohibition does not extend to Parliament.

Mr. EDWARDS: Does my hon. friend suggest that a member of Parliament is above the law of the land?

Mr. A. K. MACLEAN: No, the censor can censor newspapers and censor Hansard, but surely he cannot prohibit discussion of any matter in Parliament.

Mr. EDWARDS: That is not the point. My point is that the hon. gentleman has no right to place the contents of this book on Hansard, when the circulation of the book has been prohibited in this country.

Mr. C. A. WILSON: Parliament has full control of Hansard, and it is up to the Debates Committee or the Government, whichever is the proper authority, to prevent any particular issue of Hansard being circulated, if that is desired. But certainly we have the right to discuss the action of the censor. We have also the right to let this matter be placed on Hansard, and then it is for the government to decide whether this particular issue of Hansard shall be circulated or not. I have often heard the Prime Minister intimate that certain things should not be reported in Hansard.

Mr. A. K. MACLEAN: The censor is not empowered, under the Order in Council to prevent Parliament from speaking. That is one thing, and preventing the circulation of a book is another and an entirely different

thing. I frequently notice in the British Parliamentary reports, debates respecting the acts of the censor. I cannot give any concrete case, but on many occasions I know that specific acts of the censor have been discussed in the British Parliament.

Mr. EDWARDS: The hon. member for Halifax persists in misstating my point of order, and I say that advisedly, because he must have understood what I said. My point is not that the hon. member for Edmonton (Mr. Oliver) has no right to discuss the acts of the censor, but that he has no right to quote from a book the circulation of which has been prohibited under heavy penalties in this country, thereby circulating through the medium of Hansard the very material which the censor has declared must not be circulated.

Mr. SPEAKER (having taken the Chair): I am taken somewhat at a disadvantage in not having been able to follow the discussion from an earlier stage. As I understand it, on the motion to go into Supply the hon. member for Edmonton rose with a view to discussing a publication called "The Fiddlers." In my judgment it is not competent for an Order in Council to override the authority of Parliament, and it seems to me that it is peculiarly a matter for Parliament to determine what shall be done as to the discussion on a given matter in a given case. With the facts I have before me, I do not think the point of order raised by the hon. member for Frontenac (Mr. Edwards) is well taken.

Mr. OLIVER: I desired to read only a short extract from the book to show that it was not of the character it was represented to be by the report of Surgeon General Fotheringham. It is a criticism of the policy of the Government of Great Britain in regard to a matter of serious importance, and not a criticism in any degree of the conduct of our troops in England. I will read just a short extract from page 4, under the heading, "The Shadow of Famine":

"We have to face this grim menace," says Lord Davenport. "We are taking no chances," says the Prime Minister, and the nation will hope there is some meaning in the words. It is the tragic irony of this solemn time that so many men in high places have talked like kings and ruled like jesters.

The nation looks to Mr. Lloyd George to be equal to his words.

The Prime Minister blames the late Government that let slip the greatest opportunity in British history, for helping famine on; but it will not do. The new Government has been bringing famine nearer every day; it has allowed the destruction of enormous quantities

of food, and those who are guilty of this crime have no stones to throw at others. The Prime Minister came into office with the food shortage in sight; it was his first duty to build up the great reserve of food we might have had now in our granaries if the drink trade had not destroyed it. We could have laughed at submarines, for our barns would have been filled to overflowing, and we could have lived in comfort for a year if no ship reached us.

Let us see how much food drink has destroyed since the war began. We will take it from August 4, 1914, to April 30, 1917. It is 999 days of the war. The quantity of grain and sugar destroyed for drink has been:

	Tons.
Grain for bread..	4,400,000
Sugar for beer	340,000

It is not easy to realize what this means, but it will help us if we think of one or two examples.

The biggest thing ever set up on earth is the great Pyramid. It is 80,000,000 cubic feet. The food destroyed by drink during the war would make two great pyramids, both bigger than the pyramid of Egypt.

The longest British railway is the Great Western. It is over 3,000 miles, but it would not hold the food destroyed by drink since the war began. If every inch of it were crammed with wagons, the Great Western railway would need hundreds of miles more line to hold the train loads of food destroyed.

So vast is this incredible quantity of food destroyed by an enemy trade while famine has been coming on. We should have saved it all if Parliament had followed the King, and it would have given the whole United Kingdom its flour rations for nearly a year.

Mr. EDWARDS: Mr. Speaker, I call your attention to the fact that there is not a quorum present.

Mr. SPEAKER: I see myself that there is a quorum present. The hon. member may proceed.

Mr. OLIVER:

Take it at its minimum scientific food value, and on the basis of our rations in April, 1917, it would have given us:

	Weeks.
Flour for the whole United Kingdom...	43
Sugar for the whole United Kingdom...	33

Our three war Governments, confronted with the increasing certainty of at least a three years' war, have allowed the drink trade to destroy this vast reserve of food. It will not do for Mr. Lloyd George to blame his predecessors. He has carried on their policy of food destruction. In the first four months of 1917 he has allowed the destruction of 400,000 tons of grain to bolster up this trade in drink. It would give the United Kingdom its bread rations for thirty days; it would make all the difference till the harvest is over.

Another paragraph, page 15, reads as follows:

And now we have a new idea from the Food Control Department; it is a coloured poster of a Union Jack and a big loaf on it and "Waste not, want not," printed in big type. It was being printed on the day the Prime Minister

told the nation that America had found it is no use waving a neutral flag in the teeth of a shark. It is an eloquent and true saying, but it is also true that it is no use waving platitudes from copy books in the teeth of a wolf at the door. The Prime Minister says he is taking no chances. Let us be quite sure. We once had a Government of which men said its motto was "Wait and See." Are we better off, or are we worse, with a Government that sees and waits?

I think these extracts give a very clear idea of the purpose of the book. I notice that the report of Surgeon-General Fotheringham placed before the House by the Prime Minister has no good foundation but that it is an attempt to justify an action taken by the censorship under the authority of the Government for which there was no authority at all.

Mr. MORPHY: Does the hon. gentleman pretend to say that there is nothing objectionable in the book?

Mr. OLIVER: I do not say there is nothing objectionable.

Mr. MORPHY: Does the hon. gentleman find much that is objectionable in the book?

Mr. OLIVER: Not to me. But I can easily understand that it is very objectionable to the distillery trade of Canada as it is to the distillery trade of England.

Mr. MORPHY: I refer to the reflections upon the Canadian soldiers.

Mr. OLIVER: There are no reflections in the book on the Canadian soldiers—absolutely none made and none intended. To make it quite clear that there is no authority for the suppression of this book I will read the sections of the Order in Council which describe what constitutes objectionable matter that would bring it within the terms of the Order in Council.

Mr. EDWARDS: Mr. Speaker, I would call your attention to the fact that there is not a quorum present.

Mr. SPEAKER: I direct the clerk to take down the names.

The deputy clerk having taken down the names:

Mr. SPEAKER: The hon. member (Mr. Oliver) may proceed; there is a quorum present.

Mr. EDWARDS: Might I ask you, Mr. Speaker, how many constitute a quorum?

Mr. SPEAKER: Twenty, including the Speaker.

Mr. OLIVER: I would like to read the terms of the Order in Council under which the prohibition of the book is supposed to have taken place.

Whenever in this order the expression objectionable matter is used it shall be construed to mean and include:

(a) Any information with respect to the movements, numbers, description, condition or disposition of any of the forces, ships or aircraft of His Majesty or any of His Majesty's allies, or with respect to the plans or conduct or supposed plans or conduct of any naval or military operations by any such forces, ships or air craft, or with respect to the supply, description, condition, transport, or manufacture or storage of war materials, or with respect to any works or measures undertaken for or connected with or intended for the fortification of any place, or any information of such a nature as is calculated to be or might be directly or indirectly useful to the enemy, and

(b) Any photograph, sketch, plan, model or other representation of any naval or military work or any dock or harbour work, of such a nature that such representations thereof are calculated to be or might be, directly or indirectly, useful to the enemy, and

(c) Any false report or false statement concerning the causes or the operations of the present war, and

(d) Any report or statement intended or likely to cause disaffection to His Majesty or to interfere with the success of His Majesty's forces or of the forces of His Majesty's allies by land or sea, or to prejudice His Majesty's relations with foreign powers, and

(e) Any report or statement intended or likely to prejudice the recruiting, training, discipline or administration of any of His Majesty's forces or the operation or administration of any Act or Order in Council concerning National Service.

(f) Any report or description or purported report or description of the proceedings of any secret session of either Senate or Commons of Canada held in pursuance of a resolution passed by such Senate or Commons except such report thereof as may be officially communicated through the Secretary of State of Canada, and

(g) Any report or description or purported report or description of the proceedings at any meeting of the Cabinet of Canada, and

(h) The contents of any confidential document belonging to or any confidential information obtained from any government department or any person in the service of His Majesty.

I submit that there is nothing contained in those sections that warrants the prohibition of the circulation of this book. Yet, notwithstanding that fact, the circulation of the book is forbidden or prohibited under penalty of the imposition of a fine not exceeding $5,000, or imprisonment for any term not exceeding five years, or both fine and imprisonment. I submit that such penalties should not be invoked except in case of infraction of the laws as laid down, and when the Government undertakes to bring within the range of this punishment actions that are not offences under the law, the Government is taking a position

that cannot be characterized in modern language. This is particularly strange because this book is printed in England, is circulated in England and, so far as I am aware, is not prohibited in England. It is not prohibited in Australia. It is only in Canada that it is prohibited. I have here an advertisement which appeared in the British Weekly, a high-class publication of England:

The Fiddlers, a new book by Arthur Mee, author of Defeat. Drink in the Witness Box. Startling indictment of the British Government and the liquor trade. Playing with the greatest enemy force outside of Berlin. The facts about the food crisis. How drink has broken down the nation's food reserves. The ruin of our soldiers' homes. The war upon the soldiers' children. The effect of drink on the war by land and sea. How the drink trade is imperilling the Empire—with the truth about what a great Canadian paper calls The Blackest Tragedy of the War. A remarkable map of the allied countries and prohibition, showing how the allies are stopping drink to win the war. With cartoons, tables, new facts, and hundreds of witnesses to the way in which drink is prolonging the war. Published by Morgan & Scott. For sale everywhere the English language is spoken except in Canada.

Mr. C. A. WILSON: Is that in the advertisement?

Mr. OLIVER: Yes, that is part of the advertisement. As to the general question of the propriety of circulating arguments of this character dealing with the conduct of affairs by the Government, I have here the consideration given by the Presbytery of Manitoba to a similar book similarly prohibited, by the same author, and dealing with the same subject. The advertisement for that book as it appeared in Australia is as follows:

The book of the hour, Defeat; the truth about drink and the betrayal of Britain, by Arthur Mee and J. Stuart Holden, with an introduction by Dr. Saleeby. The book that stirs and burns. Two-color frontispiece. Price sixpence, all booksellers. For quantities apply to N.S.W. Alliance, Macdonell House, Pitt Street, Sydney. Write Box 390, G.P.O., Sydney, N.S.W.

In regard to that book the Manitoba Presbytery has the following:

And, whereas the presbytery is of the opinion that, even in the strain of war, the suppression of facts and conditions concerning a grave moral issue, however serious those facts and conditions may be, is more dangerous to the common weal than their frank disclosure and more likely to prejudice recruiting, etc., by the want of confidence thus created;

And, whereas the presbytery believe such action on the part of the Army Council and of the Canadian censor to be an undue and wholly unnecessary interference with the liberty of the subject and in direct conflict with the very principles of liberty for which Canada is fighting.

Therefore, be it resolved, that this presbytery protests most strenuously against such prohibition, and demands that the embargo upon this book be at once removed.

I may perhaps be permitted to read from what purports to be a petition presented to the Prime Minister of Canada, signed by 64,000 mothers and wives of Toronto, as follows:

1. That mothers and wives of Canada, in giving their sons and husbands for King and Empire, asked and received from your Minister of Militia this only assurance that, in sending them into the ranks, we were not thereby irrevocably thrusting them into the temptation of strong drink.

2. We appreciated, in the depths of our hearts, your action in abolishing the wet canteen from the Canadian militia. We believe the wet canteen established in the ranks at the front to be a double danger, robbing our King of the success in arms which in these days comes only to the brave heart that is controlled by a clear head; and robbing us and our Canada of the manhood which we gave into our Empire's keeping.

We do not believe that the King will refuse the aid of Canada's sons; nor that he will appreciate your patriotic efforts the less, if you keep faith with us and make known to His Majesty, his ministers and commanders, that our boys are sent forth on the one condition that the dispensing of intoxicating liquor shall be prohibited in the ranks.

Dealing with this same subject, Mr. Arthur Mee, in the London Daily News of July 11 says:

The Incredible Facts.

1. We have seen a ship that might have carried 550 tons of wheat bring instead 550 tons of rum to be drunk in 1920. The Government told us this was stopped, but the Government's statement was not true.

2. There is wheat enough in the Empire waiting for us to fetch it, to last us a year, but we have no ships to bring it; yet we have had ships, since the submarine menace reached its height, for carrying brewers' vats over thousands of miles, and ships enough to bring hundreds of thousands of cubic feet of hops to a land clamouring for bread.

3. We ask in vain for sugar; our growing children and our wounded soldiers cannot get it, our home-grown fruits must waste for want of it; 40,000 tons of it were sunk not long ago. But every day our brewers waste over a hundred tons of sugar, and they are to waste hundreds of tons a week more.

4. We are fining people £5 for destroying a loaf, but this trade is destroying 450,000 quartern loaves a day, and is now apparently to destroy 100,000 more.

5. We have enormous stocks of alcohol that could be used for munitions, and the Government appoints a committee to consider if it should be used, and so save bread. The committee has eleven members, of whom seven are distillers, and not one is a chemist, or a scientist, or an industrial expert; and this distillers' committee reports that it is not in our interest to save grain by using this hoarded alcohol!

6. This trade has not lost a penny through the war, but this very week the House of Commons has made it a present of £1,000,000.

The Board of Education teaches our children that beer cannot nourish us, but the trade which has taken 150 quartern loaves from every British cupboard since the war began is to burgle our cupboard still more, and turn our bread to beer.

Not even war can keep the grip of Nemesis from those who bring famine in their train. It is hunger and not thirst that makes a revolution.

Mr. Mee has also written an open letter to the War Council in which he says:

Gentlemen, you are conducting the greatest war of freedom in the history of mankind, and it is permissible to ask, as the Russian people are asking, if liberty is truly the end of all these things.

Quite clearly our drink question, as the greatest flour-milling paper in America says, is no longer a football for the game of British politics. With the fate of the Allies depending on food supplies, Canada and Russia and America, all prohibiting the destruction of grain for drink, may well be astounded at the spectacle of a War Council in Britain that tolerates the destruction of 450,000 loaves a day for beer.

Even fiddling like that we must stand at home, but what the British Empire will not stand is the smashing of its birthright. There is in circulation in this country a book that tells the truth about drink and the war. It gives the evidence on which the King declared that this trade prolongs the war, on which Lord Kitchener refused to touch drink as long as the war should last; on which the Prime Minister assured the nation that drink is more our enemy than Germany.

It is 'Defeat or Victory?" now brought up to date in its companion book, "The Fiddlers," and it is found in the homes of a million of our people. It is found throughout the Empire, too, for the prohibition of the Army Council was too late. But the news now comes from Canada that under the Defence of the Realm Act any person found with this book in the Dominion may be fined £1,000 and imprisoned for five years.

Is the Defence of the Realm Act really to be reduced to the depth of becoming the Defence of the Drink Trade Act? Is this trade really to enjoy the protection we give to the army? Are free Canadians to be imprisoned unless they burn this book which is freely read in England? If this is the price we are to pay for proclaiming the truth about drink there are ten thousand thousand Britons who will know the reason why.

It will be observed, Mr. Speaker, that there can be no argument about the purpose of the book, or the purpose the author has in issuing the book, and it will be evident that he backs up his book by other publications. It is further obvious that, in the realm of England the right of free speech and free argument has not been suppressed, but it is clear that in this hitherto free Canada the right of public argument has been suppressed, so far as this Government can suppress it.

Mr. CURRIE: Who is the author of this book? Is he an Austrian or a German, or where does he come from? Where was he born?

Mr. OLIVER: I do not know.

Mr. CURRIE: The hon. gentleman spends the whole evening reading statements of an obscure writer in England, wasting the time of the House.

Mr. OLIVER: The writer is very far from being obscure. He is one of the greatest writers in England, and an Englishman. As a Canadian, I, for one, protest most strongly, in the words of this English writer, that this Government of Canada has no right to use the authority that Parliament has placed in its hands for the purpose of preventing the circulation in the Dominion of Canada of information that will be to the prejudice of those who conduct the distilleries and breweries, in this country. Has the Government sunk so low that it has used its authority in that way? And, having done so, it comes before Parliament with the report of Surgeon-General Fotheringham presented by the Prime Minister in the attempt to make the people of Canada believe that this book was written as an attack upon the soldiers of Canada. I say no more discreditable exhibition was ever made by any Government in any country. My information is that there are many good men and true throughout this Dominion of Canada who have informed the Government that they hold copies of this book, and they defy Government to put in force the terms of the Order in Council. It is up to the Government, either to withdraw that Order in Council, or to enforce it. I move in amendment:

That all the words after the word "That" be struck out and the following substituted therefor:

"In the opinion of this House, inasmuch as the book called "The Fiddlers" does not contain matter in contravention of the terms of the consolidated Orders in Council respecting censorship, but is a work inspired by high moral purpose and calculated to direct public attention to the evils of the liquor traffic in the United Kingdom, it should not be suppressed."

Hon. ARTHUR MEIGHEN: I am afraid I cannot congratulate my hon. friend from Edmonton (Mr. Oliver) on the fairness of presenting this amendment at this late hour of the night, without notice to the Government. He gave no notice, so far as I am aware of it, and I think I should have been aware of it if any notice had been given.

It concerns a subject with regard to which, of course, the entire Government have the usual constitutional responsibility, but which has been peculiarly under the review of the Minister of Justice. The Minister of Justice (Mr. Doherty) had gone home long before we arrived at this particular order. The Prime Minister also, who has taken some interest in the question, had gone home before we had arrived at this order. Still, without notice, this amendment is brought upon us. No notice was given to the Administration; none of us were in possession of the documents appertaining to the motion. None of us were in possession of the book itself, or of the report of officers of the Government—either of the press censor or of Colonel Fotheringham—referring to it. We are asked to meet an amendment so precipitated. This much I know positively: the action taken in this matter was fully recommended in writing by the chief press censor for Canada, Lieut.-Colonel Chambers. I cannot understand the attitude of any hon. member who would assume for a moment that when he made that recommendation Lieut.-Col. Chambers had any ulterior motive—indeed, any motive at all save that of discharging to the best of his judgment and ability the duties of chief press censor. I do not know what is being done at present in England in regard to this matter. I rather think that the Minister of Justice would know he was conducting inquiries with the British Government with a view to ascertaining their attitude towards this publication. I know that he got a reply of some indefiniteness, and that he sent for more information; what information he received, I do not know.

This book is calculated to do harm here in Canada in a way that appertains to us peculiarly, but that does not appertain in the same way to Great Britain. It contains foul libels upon the soldiers of this country. I did not have the matter particularly under my review, but I remember an assertion in the book that a large proportion of the returned soldiers of Canada were to-day in insane asylums or afflicted with insanity by reason of disease brought on by drinking in Great Britain. A more utterly libellous and scandalous assertion could not well be conceived by any one. There are in the book other assertions approaching that—to put it mildly—in the grossness of their inaccuracy. It is true that many portions of the book have not peculiar application here, but the people have no way of telling or measuring the accuracy, the correctness, or the fairness of the assertions in the book that appertain only to Great Britain. Our information is, to put it mildly, that many of these assertions are grossly exaggerated; that they will create a false impression throughout the country as to conditions overseas. But it was with particular regard to the assertions in the publication relative to the soldiers of this country—assertions reported to us by our own reliable authorities to be absolutely false; assertions which those who ought to know should recognize as absolutely false—that the recommendation was made and followed. I do not think that we should be doing our whole duty in this country if we permit, untrammelled and uncorrected—at all events, without some restriction—a book to receive circulation which does so libel our overseas men, which does so falsely paint conditions overseas. Final action with regard to this—whether or not it has been taken I am not in a position to say just now—was withheld pending the receipt of the information that was cabled for. As the Minister of Justice has arrived, I shall not pursue the matter further. I do emphasize again, however, the unfairness to the House and to the Government of introducing after eleven o'clock at night, without any notice, a motion upon a subject entirely foreign to that which for the most part is now before Parliament.

Amendment negatived on division, and motion to go into Committee of Supply agreed to.

SUPPLY.

The House again in Committee of Supply, Mr. D. Stewart in the Chair.

Mr. A. K. MACLEAN: I suggest to the Minister of Customs (Mr. Reid) that the committee should not proceed to-night.

Mr. REID: There are just three items of the Minister of Inland Revenue. We are leaving a number of other items—

Mr. A. K. MACLEAN: I do not think that three items, or even one item, ought to go through for the Minister of Inland Revenue. I do not think that it is necessary to proceed even with those to-night.

Mr. REID: If we had had notice of this other amendment—

Mr. A. K. MACLEAN: Hon. gentlemen on this side had no notice either. It was a matter of public importance.

Mr. OLIVER: It was thoroughly understood on Saturday that I desired to move

the motion which I moved to-night. It was a matter of decision by the Speaker; the House was thoroughly aware that I had a motion to move in the matter.

Mr. REID: The hon. member may h ve given the Speaker notice; he certainly never gave the Government or any member of the Government notice.

Mr. OLIVER: I was ruled out from making the motion. The House was aware that I would make a motion in the matter upon the first opportunity upon going into Supply. This is the first opportunity.

Mr. GRAHAM: As I understand it, the hon. member endeavoured to move the motion, but it was ruled out on the ground that Supply was taken up automatically on that day.

Mr. MEIGHEN: I am informed that the Prime Minister himself was paired with the hon. member for Edmonton. I am certain that had the Prime Minister known that the motion was to come up, he would have remained in the House.

Mr. OLIVER: I did not know that we were going into Supply to-night. If my hon. friend desires to go into personal matters, I may say that when I paired with the Prime Minister I had intended to go home, not anticipating that we should take up Supply to-night.

Mr. MEIGHEN: It is admitted that we had no notice of the nature of the amendment.

Mr. OLIVER: Oh, no.

Mr. REID: If the hon. member objects, we will rise now.

Progress reported.

On motion of Hon. Mr. Reid, the House adjourned at 12 midnight.

Tuesday, September 18, 1917.

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

HOUSE OF COMMONS OFFICIALS.

OFFICIAL DEBATES BRANCH.

Sir ROBERT BORDEN moved:

That the recommendation of His Honour the Speaker, laid on the table of the House on the 12th instant, to abolish the office of secretary of the Hansard section of the Reporting Branch of the House and to appoint an official shorthand reporter to that section in grade B of the first division, under the provisions of the Civil Service Act, be concurred in.

Sir WILFRID LAURIER: Is that the recommendation of the Debates Committee of the House?

Sir ROBERT BORDEN: This is entirely under the Civil Service Act.

Sir WILFRID LAURIER: I understand the Committee on Debates agrees to that?

Motion agreed to.

PRINTING OF PARLIAMENT.

REPORTS OF THE JOINT COMMITTEE OF BOTH HOUSES DISCUSSED.

Mr. J. A. CURRIE (North Simcoe) moved:

That the third report of the joint committee of both Houses on the printing of Parliament be concurred in.

Mr. SPEAKER: I wish to direct attention to that portion of the report of the committee which is printed at page 1064 of the Votes and Proceedings:

3. That the recommendations contained in the second report of the special committee appointed to consider, inquire into and report upon the reception, treatment, care, training and re-education of the wounded, disabled and convalescent returned soldiers of the Canadian Expeditionary Forces, presented to the House of Commons on Tuesday, July 17, be not concurred in.

Obviously such a report is ultra vires of the Printing Committee. The matter was not referred to that committee, and if it were, the committee would not have power to make such a recommendation. The recommendation contained in subclause 4 of 239 would appear to be open to similar objection.

Mr. MURPHY: I drew the attention of the hon. member for Simcoe (Mr. Currie) to this matter last week, and I understood a correction was to be made.

Mr. CURRIE: Apparently, in the preparation of this report for the committee, the secretary did not make the matter sufficiently clear. The words "for additional printing" should be inserted after the word "recommendation." The House will understand that the reports of this Returned Soldiers Committee were published from day to day. That committee made this recommendation which was referred by the House to the committee on printing:

Your Committee also recommends that the Preliminary, and this Report and the Minutes of Proceedings and evidence submitted herewith, together with a suitable index to be prepared by the Clerk of the Committee, be printed in both languages in blue-book form for distribu-

tion, and as an Appendix to the Journals of the House.

What the committee on printing had to pass upon was whether it was advisable for the report to be published in blue-book form and reprinted in French, and also added as an appendix to the Journals of the House. To do that would cost the country about $40,000, and as the report has already been printed and every one interested can get a copy, the committee did not see that there was any necessity to add to the expense by issuing the evidence in blue-book form and adding another foot or two to the Journals. For that reason the committee deemed it advisable not to concur in the recommendation that was referred to it. We alone have the right to say what shall go into the Journals of the House, for instance, and the committee, after due consideration, decided that sufficient printing had been done to meet the necessities of the case. I would ask for leave to amend the report by inserting after the word "recommendation", at page 1064, the words: "for additional printing."

Sir ROBERT BORDEN: Would the hon. gentleman also explain the fourth paragraph?

Mr. CURRIE: That refers to a report presented to the Senate on the inspection of food. It dealt largely with the manufacture of whole wheat bread. Sir James Lougheed considered it advisable to have pamphlets dealing with the manufacture of whole wheat bread printed, and we concurred in that for five hundred copies, at a probable cost of about $150.

Sir ROBERT BORDEN: That would require the same amendment as to additional printing.

Mr. CURRIE: Yes, that should be there also, and I would ask permission to insert the same words in clause 4.

Sir ROBERT BORDEN: Perhaps the resolution might pass with the proviso that the report would be considered as amended by the insertion of the words "as to additional printing" in subsections 3 and 4 of section 239. It would appear from the statement of the hon. gentleman that, in both these matters, there was a recommendation in regard to printing, which was referred to the Printing Committee.

Mr. SPEAKER: To have such a motion in order, it would have to be regarded as a clerical error.

Sir WILFRID LAURIER: The whole matter dealt with in the report is very much involved, and my attention was only drawn to it yesterday. It is a very important question, and I suggest that it be deferred until to-morrow.

Sir ROBERT BORDEN: I have no objection. I think the motion of the hon. member for Simcoe (Mr. Currie) is now pretty clear, although I confess I did not understand it when I first read it. As I understand the explanation, certain questions as to the printing of the second report of the special committee mentioned were referred to the committee on printing, and they took the matter into consideration and made this recommendation. Paragraph 3 of this report would express the meaning intended to be conveyed, if after the word "recommendation" the words "for additional printing" were inserted. The same insertion should be made after the word "recommendation" in paragraph 4. The report of this committee deals altogether with the question of printing, which was properly referred to it in each case. However, the matter may stand until to-morrow.

Consideration of the third report of the Joint Committee on Printing deferred.

Mr. CURRIE moved: That the fourth report of the joint committee of both Houses on printing of Parliament be concurred in. He said: this report deals with the printing of Parliament and of the various departments. It contains suggestions, but makes no recommendations. A report was made last year, and a further report this year which is to be found on page 1094 of the Votes and Proceedings. For several years the committee have been endeavouring to bring about some reduction in the cost of printing which has increased very greatly in recent years. It will be seen from this report that in 1913 the cost of the printing of Parliament was $1,274,870. As a matter of fact, in five years it had increased from half a million to over a million and a quarter, and now in 1917 it is up to two and one-half millions dollars. We do not see that this expenditure is of any great importance, as far as information to the public is concerned. A report was made by the King's Printer with regard to the cost of printing of the various departments, which is referred to in this report. For instance, here is a report on the high cost of living. When that volume is completed and printed in French the cost to this country will be something like $40,000. That item was given me by the King's

Printer. Already $26,000 has been expended on the English edition, and, with the French edition and the other two volumes, the total cost will be $40,000. That sum of money will uniform four battalions of infantry, or it will provide four aeroplanes fully equipped. It will build four drill-halls, or four public post offices. Such unnecessary expenditures are being made annually, and there seems to be no one who can turn off the tap.

There is another report here on the Wabana iron mine which is in Newfoundland. The Mines Department, which is a great sinner in respect to additional increase in the cost of printing, has spent something like $5,000 publishing a big book with regard to a mine not in Canada, and with which Canada has nothing to do. There is also a great deal published in regard to other matters which it would take a Philadelphia lawyer to understand. Volumes are published on the hydrometric survey of rivers away up on the Hudson bay which no one is interested in. This book is not only published once, but annually. This question of the cost of printing has been referred to us by this House to see if we can make some suggestion in regard to it. We have suggested that the map-making of the country should be placed under one bureau, and that there should be standard maps. At present each department gets a fresh map, and there are hundreds and thousands of maps published which are of no use, whereas, if there were a standard map, reference could be made to it.

Then another matter for consideration is the material that is printed. We consider that the Government should take from the ranks of the Civil Service an editorial committee of, say, three men, to consider such questions and make suggestions. This editorial committee would meet and decide with regard to the publications in any department, and nothing but the personal order of the minister would override their decision. As near as I can ascertain, 80 per cent of the printing is done without reference to the ministers of the different departments. If there were an editorial board of that kind, the various departmental officers, if they wanted to publish anything in regard to the Wabana iron mine would make a report, which would come before the minister, giving an estimate of the cost, and the minister would consider whether it would be in the interest of the country to spend ten or fifteen thousand dollars in useless work. That committee would also prevent duplication. We have been endeavouring to prevent duplication in the various departments. Some of the most expensive documents issued by the Government are those dealing with trade, and we are endeavouring to arrange so that there will be only one publication dealing with trade, whereas at present there are two or three. The Census Branch issues a publication dealing with the trade question, and the Customs Department publishes two or three volumes dealing with other such matters, and the Department of Trade and Commerce issues other publications. This matter has been going on previous to this Government coming into power, nothing has been initiated by this Government to create additional cost. We think there should be something done to improve the system and that this proposed board should have the supervision of these matters, and refer to the chief of the department any publication in that department that they did not consider it advisable to print. The report is before the committee. There is no recommendation that requires an expenditure of money.

Sir ROBERT BORDEN: The effective suggestion which has been placed before the House by the committee is this:

> The most effective way to bring about economies in Canadian Parliamentary and Departmental printing is, in the opinion of the committee, to create an editorial board of three members of the Civil Service, thoroughly conversant with public affairs, and with a knowledge of Departmental workings. This board should have plenary powers to order such excisions of "copy" of Departmental reports, leaflets, bulletins, memoirs, etc., or to refuse to sanction the printing of any report if, in their judgment, the public interest would not be seriously affected by such refusal.
>
> It would be the duty of the Board to call upon the Deputy Head of any Department or Branch of the Public Service created by Parliament, whose requisition and "copy" for printing were under consideration, to show cause why any proposed reductions in "copy" should not be made or the printing thereof suspended entirely, and only upon direct written authority of the Minister of the Department interested should the decision of the Board of Editors be countermanded.
>
> The Board should present a report of its operations annually to Parliament within three weeks after the opening of each session thereof, such report to give the dates when first and last "copy" of every departmental report is received, and specifying the reductions in text, and the reasons therefor. In cases where the decision of the Board has been overridden by the Minister of any department Parliament shall be advised.

The suggestions in the three paragraphs which I have just read are worthy of at-

tentive consideration; that consideration will be given. I have already discussed the subject to some extent with my colleagues, and I feel confident that we shall either adopt the report of the committee as it has been presented to the House, or modify it to the extent of having two or three members of the Government associated with the members of the Civil Service in the editorial committee referred to. That might, perhaps be desirable. However, we have not reached a fixed conclusion on that point. I am confident that some effective way of carrying out the suggestions of the committee will be found.

It is pointed out in the report that in some of the departments the recommendations made last year by the committee have been pretty fully carried out. In other departments, it is thought, there is still room for improvement. This report will be commended to the consideration of the permanent head of each department with a view to having the suggestions of the committee carried out in their entirety in the respective departments, unless there is good reason to the contrary. It is possible that in making some of these comments the committee did not have before them absolutely full information as to the subjects which are dealt with, but generally speaking I believe that the suggestions are worthy of consideration, which will be accorded.

As to the increased cost of printing during the last five years, it is due in part to the increased printing rendered necessary by the war and in part to the increased cost of paper, which has been very great, especially during the past two years. I have no objection to the House concurring in the report which the committee have made.

Sir WILFRID LAURIER: I am not sure that I approve the recommendations made with regard to certain information which is annually given to Parliament. The information given to Parliament by any department is under the responsibility of the minister; he prepares his own report every year, and he may supplement that report by other information which he thinks it advantageous to publish. I do not think that we can gain anything by taking away the responsibility of the minister in this matter. I see here that several—I will not say criticisms, rather reflections, are made with respect to some of the publications. The report of the committee says:

> "Economy" will have to be Canada's watchword for many years to come, and the printing Bills of Parliament and the public Departments present a fertile field for action in this regard. That our great neighbours to the south realize this in connection with Congressional publications is shown by the decision of the Senate of the United States to cut down this year its printing bills by $470,000. This has been brought about by reducing the bulk of some reports and suspending entirely the publication of others.

Well, that is a matter for the minister. He is giving the information to the public; it is for him to see that that information is as concise as possible. It does not follow that the giving of the information should be entirely suppressed. Then the report goes on to mention the United States reports which have been cut down:

> Among the latter may be mentioned: Monthly Summary of Foreign Commerce, Annual Report of Foreign Commerce and Navigation, Report of District of Columbia Health Office, Bulletins of the Bureau of Ethnology, annual report ditto; Bulletins of the Bureau of Fisheries, Geological Bulletins, Geological Professional papers, Geological Water Supply papers, Memoirs of the National Academy of Sciences, Nautical Almanac, Annual Report of Bureau of Soils, and many others.

Some of our publications are similar to these. The Department of Trade and Commerce issues a good many reports; according to this recommendation, the precedent of the United States should be followed and many of those reports should be cut down. The report of the committee says that in the United States the monthly summary of foreign commerce has been eliminated. We have something like that here; it is a very useful publication, and should not be cut down. We have also a report of foreign commerce and navigation; I would say the same about that report. If we find that departmental publications are too bulky or give useless information, we can call attention to the matter, but for my part I should not like to suppress the publication of these reports or to take away from the minister the responsibility of having them brought down in proper form.

Mr. CURRIE: It is not the intention of the committee to take any of the responsibility from the minister. The formation of an editorial board will not have that effect; it will not interfere with the duties of the minister or the functions of the departments. It will endeavour to cut down the size of the volume by better editorial work and it will point out to a minister, when any of his officials send in a volume for publication, whether any other department has published a similar volume. The Conservation Commission, for instance, is issu-

ing very extensive reports covering matters that have already been covered by other departments. The editorial board would have supervision in that regard. The committee had no intention of interfering with the duties of any of the ministers or the work of any of the departments; the only desire was to see that more supervision should be exercised with a view to preventing too great a cost in the publication of these reports. The Auditor General's Report, for instance, has been published in English and in French. The department has decided to publish the headings in English and in French and to put the whole thing in one volume. For years we have been spending about $25,000 more than was necessary on that report. The intention of the committee was, according to the request of Parliament, to bring in a report with a view to a reduction in the cost of printing. We are at war, and it is necessary for us to economize. On behalf of the committee, I thank the Prime Minister for his suggestion that the departments should be asked to give consideration to the report.

Motion agreed to, and fourth report of the committee concurred in.

Mr. CURRIE moved:

That the fifth report of the joint committee of both Houses on the printing of Parliament be concurred in.

Sir WILFRID LAURIER: What does this report deal with?

Mr. CURRIE: This is a recommendation that, in the absence of the sittings of the Printing Committee, the joint chairmen may have the power to order publication of any documents that may be sent from the House. That is done every year.

Motion agreed to.

RETURNED SOLDIERS—IDENTIFICATION BADGES.

On the Orders of the Day:

Hon. Sir SAM HUGHES: At the front, officers, non-commissioned officers and men of the various divisions are, by authority, allowed to wear distinctive badges. Soldiers from those divisions returning to Canada have been in the habit of wearing them. Recently, by somebody's order, not always carried out in the most courteous manner, officers, non-commissioned officers and men, on reaching Canada, have been brusquely told to remove those badges. I would ask the Minister of Militia by whose authority that is done and why?

Sir EDWARD KEMP: The badges to which my hon. friend refers are what are known as identification badges of the divisions at the front. The badge appears on the arm or sometimes on the back of the tunic. They are not badges for distinguished conduct in the war. I understand the badges for the Victoria Cross and the Distinguished Service Order are not on all fours with these badges. The order is an order of the Imperial Army, and requires those badges to be removed when the soldiers leave France if they are on leave. I have only heard of one case in this country in which a soldier has been spoken to on the street, and there was no attempt at that time to speak to the soldiers in a discourteous manner. It was the provost-marshal who spoke to the man about his wearing the badge being against the regulations.

Sir SAM HUGHES: I have twenty instances, and I want to know why soldiers are not permitted to wear those badges in Canada.

Sir EDWARD KEMP: It is an order of the Imperial Army, and the Canadian Army follows that order in that soldiers remove those badges when they leave France.

Sir SAM HUGHES: I have never seen such an order for the Imperial service, although I have tried very hard to find it. I have known officers returned to England being ordered to wear those badges.

FIRST CONTINGENT DISTINCTIVE BADGE.

On the Orders of the Day:

Mr. J. A. CURRIE (North Simcoe): I would ask the Minister of Militia if an order has been promulgated permitting soldiers of the First Division to wear their blue shoulder strap? There is an Imperial order in England to that effect. I understand that some provost-marshals have ordered soldiers to take off their blue shoulder badge or, if they are in the artillery, their red shoulder badge.

Sir EDWARD KEMP: I am unable to answer my hon. friend's question to-day. I will endeavour to obtain information regarding it.

THIRD READING.

Bill No. 132, to amend the Companies Act. —Mr. Meighen.

JUDGES ACT AMENDMENT.

The House proceeded to the consideration of an amendment made by the Senate to Bill No. 66, to amend the Judges Act.—Mr. Doherty.

Hon. C. J. DOHERTY (Minister of Justice): This Bill, as introduced into this House, provided simply salaries for an additional High Court judge of the province of Saskatchewan, as required by the legislation of that province, and for a County Court judge in the province of Ontario similarly required, and it made a regulation as to the travelling expenses of judges and as to the application to circuit court judges in Montreal of the provinces providing for inquiries applicable to the present County Court judges.

The Bill as it left this House was approved by the Senate in its entirety, but that honourable body added a number of amendments dealing with the general subject of the duties of judges. I am not prepared to say that certain of those amendments in principle might not be accepted, but before we could accept them I think they would require considerable modification from the very general terms in which they are expressed, and the very general effect given to them. They raise a very important question which it seems to me can hardly be dealt with suitably by this House in considering amendments introduced by the other House to a Bill of this nature, and especially at this stage of the session, when it is difficult, if not impossible, to give to these important amendments the consideration they deserve.

The first of these proposed amendments is to repeal certain legislation enacted in the year 1906. That legislation, which amended previously existing legislation, made special provision for the payment of full pensions to judges after they had reached a certain age and had served a certain number of years upon the bench. The amendment before us proposes to repeal the legislation of 1906, which would leave the law as it stood previously to that time, and provide for the payment of a two-thirds pension only, in cases where a man had served fifteen years or had become incapacitated by illness. Speaking for myself, I would raise no objection to the proposed repeal, but for the fact that it raises an important question as to the protection and preservation of the rights of judges appointed under that legislation. The only proviso in the amendment protecting any vested right is one to protect the rights of judges who have actually retired under that law and are in receipt of their pensions.

The next amendment deals with section 33 of the Judges Act, which in general terms prohibits judges from engaging in any other occupation or business. The proposed amendment would prohibit the judges from performing any duties outside of their judicial duties. I am not prepared to say that there would not be an advantage in making more precise the prohibitions at present existing, but the prohibition as adopted by the Senate is very widely beyond the mark, because it is obvious that there are some duties that man must perform, even though he be a judge, which are not judicial duties.

The other amendments follow, I think, upon this last-mentioned one. They contain a prohibition against the judge receiving a remuneration for the performance of any duty outside of his judicial duties. As the section stands, he is already prohibited from performing any such duty, and the amendment makes certain limitations and restrictions to the general prohibition proposed, in favour of duties imposed by the provincial legislatures.

I am not prepared to say that in principle these amendments have not a great deal to commend them to the consideration of this House, but it seems to me quite clear that before we could accept them they would have to be modified in very important particulars in their wording. As I have already said, they bring up very important questions in connection with the independence of the judiciary, which I think deserve very careful consideration before such serious modifications in the law are made.

Although I have had no formal conference, I have had some communication with the hon. gentlemen of the Senate and they seem disposed rather to share the view that these important questions could be dealt with in another manner. For these reasons, I beg to move:

That the amendments made by the Senate to this Bill be not concurred in, and that a message to that effect be sent to that honourable House.

Sir WILFRID LAURIER: Please read the amendments one by one.

Mr. SPEAKER: I must present the motion as I have it, unless the minister consents to alter it.

Mr. DOHERTY: There is no objection on my part if it is thought desirable, but the same reasons apply to all the amendments.

Mr. MACDONALD: What is the nature of these amendments?

Mr. SPEAKER: The amendment is:

Page 1, line 32.—After clause 4 add clauses 5, 6, 7, 8 and 9, as follows:

5. (1) Sections 20, 22, as enacted by section 3 of chapter 39 of the statutes of 1908, and 25, as enacted by section 9 of chapter 28 of the statutes of 1913, of the said Act are hereby repealed; but such repeal shall not be construed to affect the pension of any judge who before the passing of this Act has resigned or been retired.

(2) Section 26 of the said Act, as enacted by section 9 of chapter 28 of the statutes of 1913, is amended by striking out the words "sections 24 and 25" and substituting therefor the words "section 24."

Mr. PUGSLEY: Why is section 25 left out? As I understand the amendment, it limits the pension a judge of a Superior Court shall receive after a certain length of service, or after he has reached a certain age, to two-thirds of his salary, but it leaves the law as at present, regarding the right of a judge to retire after a shorter period in case of illness.

I am inclined to think there is a great deal of good sense in the amendment which has been made by the Senate. If the country provides that after a reasonable term of service a judge may retire with two-thirds of his salary, and enjoy the leisure a judge is no doubt entitled to enjoy upon retirement, the country would be treating him with a fair measure of justice, and I, for one, would be disposed to support the amendment which has been made by the Senate.

Mr. MACDONALD: I agree with my hon. friend from St. John (Mr. Pugsley). There are instances throughout the country where judges have reached the age when it is known to the Bar they are not able to give that full service to the country which ought to be expected from them, but they carry on a little longer than they otherwise would with the hope of getting their full salary on retirement. One does not need to particularize these cases, because I am quite sure hon. gentlemen know of them. This is not a desirable state of affairs. It is a good rule and in the interests of the country, and would be more satisfactory in the administration of justice, that judges should retire after the period of service fixed by the Act, with the certainty of getting two-thirds of their salaries, and that they should not get any more by prolonging their stay upon the Bench. I do not very well see why the Minister of Justice would not accept an amendment of that kind.

Sir ROBERT BORDEN: The amendment which it is now sought to strike out of the Judges Act was introduced, I think, in 1908, and there was a subsequent amendment in 1913. The considerations upon which that legislation was submitted to Parliament were very much along the line just placed before the House by my hon. friend from St. John and my hon. friend from Pictou (Mr. Macdonald). It was supposed that the operation of the Act in question would bring about the retirement of judges after a certain period, and under conditions when that retirement might be considered to be in the public interest; that is to say, it was believed at that time, whether rightly or wrongly, that a judge sometimes continued in the discharge of his judicial duties for a longer period than was consistent with the public interest because of his desire to retain his full salary by continuing in office, which desire, from his standpoint, might have been emphasized by the condition of his personal affairs. Then it was supposed that if a judge had given a certain service, or reached a certain age, and if he was in a position to retire upon his full salary, a condition then thought undesirable would be remedied, and the very thing which my hon. friends desire to avoid would be avoided. I am not at all confident that the operation of the statute has been precisely along the lines anticipated when this

4 p.m. legislation was first introduced, and I believe there is good reason for reconsidering it. At the same time, I do not think it can be reconsidered in precisely the form which has been suggested, nor do I think it desirable that we should undertake the revision of the Act by the method which is suggested here, namely, an amendment to a Bill of this character. We must remember that one of the most important principles with regard to the independence of judges—and no one could overrate the importance of that consideration—is permanence of tenure of office during good behaviour, and fixity of remuneration. It is therefore apparent that continued or repeated changing of the salaries of judges, or of the pensions to which they become entitled upon their retirement, is undesirable. For that reason also, I think it important that the principle of the amendment and the method of the amendment should be very carefully considered, and that it would hardly do for this House, with the hurried consideration we can give the matter at present, to deal with so important a subject now.

Sir WILFRID LAURIER: I do not rise to a point of order, but so far as my experience goes, when a Bill comes amended from the Senate, the question is first put upon one amendment, then upon the second, then upon the third, because the House may concur in one, and not in another.

Mr. SPEAKER: I will look up the point. As I view it at present, I think it is open for the House to concur in or reject the amendments as a whole. In any event, the motion is in respect of the first amendment.

Sir ROBERT BORDEN: I think my right hon. friend is perfectly correct, as a matter of procedure. We are proceeding with the amendments one by one. There are five different sections added to the Bill, and we are taking them one after another. I think the matter had better be postponed, for another reason. When we do not concur in an amendment made by the Senate to one of our Bills, it is usual that we should accompany the non-concurrence with the reasons. My hon. friend (Mr. Doherty) has stated the reasons in his observations, but it seems to me, practice requires that they should be more formally stated, and should be embodied in the motion presented to the House. I would therefore suggest, Mr. Speaker, that the matter be taken up on another day, when the motion would embody the reasons which would lead the House to the conclusion that the amendments be not concurred in. What I say would apply to the section as to which we have already expressed non-concurrence—that is it should be regarded as still open, for the purpose I have mentioned.

Sir GEORGE FOSTER: I move that the debate be now adjourned.

Motion agreed to and debate adjourned.

MILITARY VOTERS ACT, 1917.

SENATE AMENDMENTS CONCURRED IN.

Hon. C. J. DOHERTY (Minister of Justice) moved: That the House do concur in the amendments made by the Senate to Bill No. 127, the Military Voters' Act, 1917. He said: The first amendment is to section 1 and consists in striking out the adjective "complete" before the word demobilization. That refers to the application of this Bill.

The next amendment is to section 2 paragraph (c) and corrects the name of the Royal Naval Air Service. The words "aviation service" had been used in the Bill.

Then there is a group of amendments made in order to place an officer in the same position as a private with reference to his discharge from the army. An officer is not discharged, but is either permitted to resign or his services are dispensed with.

There is an amendment to section 2 striking out the word "other" which had evidently crept in through a printer's error.

There is an amendment to section 13 dealing with the duties of the returning officer as to sending his report to the Clerk of the Crown in Chancery. As the Bill left this House that section provided that he should do this after the sixth day after he had made his final addition. The amendment of the Senate consists of inserting the word "immediately" before the word "after." There is no doubt that was the intention, and the insertion of the word "immediately" makes that clear.

Amendments concurred in.

INSURANCE ACT AMENDMENT.

SENATE AMENDMENTS CONCURRED IN.

Hon. C. J. DOHERTY moved: That the House do concur in the amendments made by the Senate to Bill No. 53, respecting Insurance. He said: The only amendment is to paragraph (h) of section 134. That paragraph, as it left this House, provided that if the policy provides that written notice of injury must be given to the company within a specified period after the date of the accident causing such injury, such period shall be not less than thirty days.

The Senate has amended that section by substituting "20" for "30." That is the sole amendment.

Amendment concurred in.

SALARIES OF RAILWAY COMPANY EMPLOYEES.

Rt. Hon. Sir ROBERT BORDEN moved: That the House proceed to Public Bills and Orders, for the purpose of taking up Order 37, Bill 103, from the Senate, concerning the payment of salaries or wages of employees of railway companies. He said: This Bill has been passed on previous occasion by this House, but was rejected by the Senate. It has now been passed by the Senate and sent down to us. The provisions have relation to the wages or salaries of persons employed on railways. These provisions are embodied in the Railway Act which is now before the Senate. I sincerely hope that Bill will pass the Senate, although there is some controversy about certain clauses. If that Bill should not be passed

by the Senate, it is desirable that the measure before us should be passed by this House, and for that reason I desire to take it up to-day.

Motion agreed to.

On motion of Sir Robert Borden Bill 103 concerning the salaries or wages of employees of railway companies, was read the second time, and the House went into committee thereon, Mr. Rainville in the Chair.

On section 1—R.S., c. 37; a. 259 amended. Payment of wages.

Mr. CARVELL: This Bill seems to be an exact counterpart of a section which we added to the Consolidated Railway Act, which provides that the employee shall be paid semi-monthly. I am heartily in sympathy with the provision.

Sir ROBERT BORDEN: In case the Railway Bill should not pass the Senate, I think it is desirable this legislation should be enacted, but I shall not move the third reading of it at present, in the hope that the Railway Bill will pass the Senate, because it would be undesirable to have the same enactment in two different Bills.

Mr. CARVELL: I feel that it would be a great misfortune if the Consolidated Railway Bill did not get through the Senate, especially as I understand there is no question about the provisions of that Bill, excepting two matters, which are very largely—I was going to say—personal and local affairs. One of these matters is some sort of a quarrel between the Hydro-Electric in Ontario, and the Toronto Electric Light Company and the Toronto and Niagara Power Company. The other difference is between the Bell Telephone Company and the Independent Telephone Companies. The special railway committee occupied six or seven weeks in considering this measure, and representatives of labour unions and other interests in Canada attended the meetings of this committee and took part in the discussion, and I think it would be a great misfortune if all the time and labour of the special railway committee and of these gentlemen representing other interests should go for naught, and that the Bill should not become law. I simply opposed these clauses as a matter of principle and had no personal interest, but if it should turn out that these two clauses were the only hitch, surely they will drop them and let us have the Bill, because I think there were very many important changes embodied in that measure which the business of this country demands. Nothing has happened in my somewhat lengthy Parliamentary career that has pleased me any more than the sense of public duty which seemed to inspire the special committee of this House which considered that Bill. There were no politics in it. I never saw an instance, from the beginning to the end, where political feeling played the faintest part in the consideration of the measure. Every one was actuated by the desire to make that Bill as perfect and workable as possible, and the underlying principle of the whole Bill was that wherever there was a question of dispute between corporations and the public, it was invariably left to the Railway Board to decide, and while I do not know that they want any bouquets or compliments from me, I may say that I think the Railway Board to-day is an institution of which this country should be proud. I feel that we are safe in leaving disputed matters to a board of that kind, and, therefore, if the Senate cannot agree on those two clauses, I hope an arrangement will be made by which the remainder of the Bill will become law, and those two matters can be taken up next session.

Sir ROBERT BORDEN: I agree with the hon. gentleman in regard to the good service rendered to the country by the Board of Railway Commissioners. It is beyond question that the members of the board are inspired by a strong sense of public duty, and give the best of their energy and ability to the work with which they are charged. It would be a great pity if the work of the special committee, which reported the Railway Bill to the House, should be lost. I am very glad to hear what my hon. friend has said of the work of that committee. It is entirely in accordance with what I have heard from other sources. It is most desirable that the Bill should be passed. I can assure my hon. friend that I have impressed that point as strongly as is in my power upon those now dealing with the Bill. It is my hope that it may get through. If it should not pass, it is important that this provision, and possibly one or two other provisions which were inserted in the Railway Bill, should become law. I do not think any explanation of the provisions of the Bill before us is required. It is a very simple Bill.

Section agreed to.

Sir ROBERT BORDEN: I move that the committee rise, report progress and ask leave to sit again this day. This is in order that some additional provisions which are

not controversial in the Senate may be considered and perhaps added to the Bill.

Motion agreed to, and progress reported.

SUPPLY.

CLAIMS UNDER PELAGIC SEALING TREATY.—VICTORIA, B.C. SEALING COMPANY.

On motion of Rt. Hon. Sir Robert Borden (Prime Minister) for Committee of Supply:

Mr. E. M. MACDONALD (Pictou): I take advantage of this motion, Mr. Speaker, to bring to the attention of the House a matter of very great importance. I should have brought the matter up earlier in the session had it not been for the fact that upon previous occasions when the House was going into Committee of Supply I was unable to arrange with the Minister of Marine and Fisheries (Hon. J. D. Hazen) for a discussion of the matter upon days convenient either to him or to myself. In this respect I do not blame the minister, whose department the matter specially affects. He spoke to me last week expressing his desire that the question should be discussed, and regretting that personal reasons compelled him to leave here on Saturday.

The matter which I desire to bring to the attention of the House is the right of the Victoria Sealing Company, of British Columbia, composing nine-tenths of the people engaged in the sealing industry in Canada, to participate in the fund which is to-day in the hands of the Government as a result of the Pelagic Sealing Treaty which was entered into at Washington on July 7, 1911. In order that the House may fully understand the matter, it will be necessary for me to read from public documents at some length, but in a comprehensive way I shall state at the beginning the facts of the case.

On the date which I have mentioned there was a gathering at Washington of representatives of the United States, Russia, Japan, and Canada—the latter acting on behalf of Great Britain—and there was entered into what is known as the Pelagic Sealing Treaty. Under that treaty, in consideration of British subjects giving up the right to sealing in the Pacific ocean, Canada was to receive a certain percentage of the value of the seal skins taken by the United States, Russia, and Japan at their respective rookeries in the Northern Pacific. The treaty was for a period of fifteen years from December 15, 1911, or so long thereafter as the treaty should not be terminated by either one of the contracting parties giving twelve months' notice of their desire to bring it to a conclusion. For the period of fifteen years British subjects refrained from engaging in pelagic sealing, and there will be paid to Canada in respect of that period an amount approximating $7,250,000. Already $200,000 have been paid by the United States to Canada on account of the amount payable to Canada as a compensation for her refraining from engaging in the sealing industry. There existed in British Columbia at that time what was known as the Victoria Sealing Company, which had been formed in the year 1900 by British Columbia sealers, all British subjects engaged in the sealing industry. This company controlled 43 out of the 46 vessels on the Pacific coast engaged in the sealing industry.

The money received by the Government of Canada under the treaty mentioned was not to go into the treasury, but to compensate those who had been engaged in the industry, and who, by reason of Canada's undertaking, were prevented from further engaging in this very profitable means of earning money and of developing an industry. Out of that $200,000 there has been paid out, as the result of certain recommendations made by Mr. Justice Audette, the sum of $60,000; the balance is in the hands of the Government. That amount of approximately $60,000 was not paid to the company to which I have referred; they claim that it should have been paid to them. Under the facts which I propose to present, I submit that this Government should provide for the payment of that money to the Victoria Sealing Company. Not only should the remainder of the amount received be paid over to them, but also whatever amount should be arrived at, upon a proper assessment of damages based upon those considerations, not purely of law, but of equity and fair dealing, which, according to our legal authorities, bind the Government in their dealings with subjects in cases of this kind.

The complaint is that the Government retain that money, and apparently propose to retain future moneys paid in on that account, without any regard to these owners of 43 vessels which had been engaged in the sealing industry. I wish to press upon the Government the wisdom of providing for an assessment of damages. Had we been able to bring the matter to the attention of the House at an earlier date, which unfortunately we were not for the reasons

I have mentioned, we should have asked the Government to provide that the matter be left to a committee of the House for investigation. Or, if that were not done, a tribunal might be constituted to assess the damages on the basis I have stated.

That the House may be properly seized of the facts, I may be permitted to give some general information upon the subject. By a Treaty between Her late Majesty's Government and the Government of the United States, an agreement was come to whereby the matters in dispute between the two powers relating to the Behring sea fisheries were submitted to a tribunal which met at Paris in 1893. On that tribunal Great Britain was represented by the late Lord Hannen and the late Sir John Thompson, then Minister of Justice and Attorney General of Canada; the late Sir Charles Russell, former English Attorney General, and afterwards Lord Chief Justice of England, and Sir Charles Hibbert Tupper, who at that time was Minister of Marine and Fisheries of the Canadian Government, were counsel for the British Government. The claim put forward on behalf of the United States at that time was to the effect that the Behring sea was a "mare clausum," or closed sea, and that, therefore, the British sealers had no right to fish there. Having regard to the principles of maritime law which applied to different nations as to seas which were known as closed seas within the terms of international law, power was given to the Paris tribunal to decide the question, and it was also agreed, in the event of their denying the claim of the United States, that they should make such regulations as they might deem advisable for the preservation and protection of the Behring sea seal fisheries.

The events which led up to the arbitration are: The sealing industry of British Columbia began in 1873 by the fitting out of a few vessels for hunting seals in the North Pacific ocean and the Behring sea. It gradually grew in importance until, at the time of the Paris arbitration, there were 59 sealing vessels sailing out of the port of Victoria, and the industry supplied occupation and profit to some 1,500 people. During the period above-mentioned, the only other people who engaged in seal fishing in the Behring sea to any extent were subjects of the United States. There was, however, a considerable difference in the manner of killing the seals as between British subjects and the citizens of the United States. I do not want to go into the details of pelagic sealing, but it is necessary for the purpose of understanding the matter to know that the seals have their "rookeries" on shore, to which they resort for breeding purposes, and none of these rookeries are situate in British territory, but are situate in the territories of the United States, Japan and Russia. The British sealers, therefore, were obliged to pursue their industry entirely on the high seas, whereas the American sealers did most of their killing on land, the privilege of doing which the United States Government leased to certain of its citizens, just as we give canning licenses to men who engage in the lobster industry or fishing licenses to those who engage in that industry. In the year 1886 armed revenue cutters of the United States began to seize all British sealers operating in the Behring sea, and the British sealers appealing for protection, their right to pursue their calling on the high seas was supported by the British Government. Diplomatic negotiations took place with the United States Government, and in the year 1891 a temporary modus vivendi was arrived at whereby a partial and temporary prohibition of sealing on the high seas was agreed to, somewhat similar to the permanent prohibition which was finally determined by the arrangement at Washington in 1911. At that time the position taken by Great Britain was expressed by the Right Hon. W. H. Smith, then the leader of the British House of Commons, who, in announcing to the House the arrangement arrived at, said:

> I am going to do a friendly act in the interests of a friendly power, but if I do that and interfere with certain men and their business, I shall pay compensation out of the British Exchequer, upon proof being made to the commissioner as to how far they have been affected by that partial prohibition.

At that period of our history in connection with this question, the British Government laid down the proposition that the parties who had been engaged in this industry, the continuance of which was interfered with by arrangements with a foreign power, should, in equity and right, receive compensation by reason of the fact that they were debarred for the time being from pursuing their lawful occupation. The result was that following the policy announced by Mr. Smith, the sum of $200,000 was paid out of the British Exchequer to the Victoria sealers as compensation for the partial and temporary prohibition which involved

the loss, in the year 1892, of a portion of the sealing season to them. The significance and importance of this Act on the part of the British Government, having regard to the present situation, cannot be too strongly emphasized, because it settles beyond all question the fact that the policy of the Imperial Government was to admit the right of compensation to those temporarily debarred from pursuing their lawful business.

In 1893 the Paris tribunal met, and the right of the British sealers to fish in the Behring sea was sustained. The contention of the United States that the Behring sea was a closed sea was held not to be correct, and compensation for the illegal seizure of British ships by the American revenue cutters was later assessed and paid by the United States. The total compensation awarded amounted to the sum of $425,000, all of which was paid by the United States Government, and afterwards paid by the British Government to the men who were engaged in the sealing industry in Victoria, B.C. Although in this case the compensation related to illegal seizures, we have the recognition of the right of compensation to people engaged in this industry as a result of their being deprived for a time of the opportunity of engaging in it. In consequence of what was called the Paris Award, certain regulations were drawn up and promulgated by the tribunal whereby a close season for sealing was established, also a protected zone of sixty miles radius from the Pribyloff islands, where lay the American rookeries, within which sealing on the high seas, or, as it is called, pelagic sealing, was entirely prohibited. This prohibited zone covered the whole waters of the North Pacific within which it was possible for seals to be found in paying numbers, and embraced an area of some 5,000,000 square miles of open ocean. The regulations also prohibited the use of guns in killing the seals, and allowed spears only, and made sundry rules greatly to the detriment of the Canadian sealers. Lord Hannen, one of the British representatives, assented with great reluctance to those regulations, but Sir John Thompson, also a member of the tribunal, declined to sign or be a party to the terms of the regulations as they had been recommended. Those who were in the sealing business in Victoria endeavoured to continue their business in spite of these regulations, and in the year 1900 they formed themselves into what is known as the Victoria Sealing Company in order to effect economies in operation. But in spite of this, it was impossible to carry on the industry with profit, and it gradually dwindled until 1908 when four vessels, not included in the Victoria Sealing Company, which began sealing in 1903, prepared to defy all regulations and restrictions and did, in fact, carry on sealing operations in systematic defiance of the regulations until 1911, after which British ships ceased to leave the port of Victoria for the sealing grounds and the old British industry of sealing on the high seas became a thing of the past—killed by regulations.

It is important at this juncture to note that the exception to which I have just referred, namely, those four vessels which continued to engage in the sealing business in defiance of the regulations, as I am instructed, are the only four which have received any compensation as the result of the inquiry of Mr. Justice Audette, which fact naturally would strike one as being amomalous in a great many ways. Of course, on the face of it, they were legally engaged in sealing, but actually they were engaged in sealing contrary to the regulations which had been promulgated by the Paris Tribunal. The Victoria Sealing Company, which had their vessels tied up at the wharf because they were observing the regulations, are the very people who have not received any compensation.

Up to the time of the regulations the Japanese had not engaged in pelagic sealing, but seeing the advantage that they, as outsiders not being parties to or bound by the regulations, would have in sealing in the prohibited zone around the Pribyloff islands and the coasts of British Columbia, they at once started to seal there with such persistency, encouraged and bonused by their own Government, that the seals were in danger of being exterminated if the sealing were not stopped. In 1897, the United States Government, fully appreciating the futility of the regulations owing principally to the action of the Japanese, sought the help of the British Government to put an end altogether to sealing on the high seas in the Behring Sea.

It will be recalled that about this time there were other questions of dispute between Canada and the United States, and a conference was held in the city of Quebec in the year 1897, at which among other things the Alaskan boundary, the tariff, and other questions were discussed. The Imperial Government in that year delegated to the Canadian Government the task of representing them in their negotiations with the United States in regard to the settlement of all these international questions,

and it is a matter of history that that was the first occasion on which the British Government had ever committed to Canada the right to carry on negotiations on her behalf. These negotiations in the past had always been conducted by direct representatives of the Imperial Government. There was a long-continued period of negotiations in 1897 which culminated in the Pelagic Sealing Treaty made in Washington on the 7th of July, 1911, between representatives of the United States, Russia, Japan and Canada as representing Great Britain, whereby Canada in consideration of British subjects in this country and in other parts of the Empire giving up the right of sealing on the high seas, was to receive a certain percentage of the seal skins taken by the United States, Russia and Japan during a period of fifteen years. It is estimated, and I think the amount is correct, that under that agreement Canada will receive $7,250,000 in the fifteen years. Shortly after the treaty was made, the United States made an advance payment of $200,000.

In order that hon. gentlemen may fully understand the exact position of the Victoria Sealing Company it is necessary for me to go back a little in order to connect up my argument. It will be remembered that the Canadian Government had from the very beginning of the negotiations in 1894 insisted that a great injustice was being done to the Victoria sealers, and when the United States took up with Canada the question of the abolition of sealing on the high seas, the Canadian Government at once asserted the right to compensation of the sealers engaged. A joint high commission of representatives of Canada and the United States to deal with the various questions at issue between the United States and Great Britain was then appointed and met at Quebec.

At the same time, to show the importance of the sealing industry, a valuation was made by an appraiser named Captain Taylor, of Halifax, N.S., on behalf of the Canadian Government, of the vessels and outfits of the Canadian sealers with a view to compensating them for the loss of their industry. Captain Taylor arrived at a valuation of $553,129.70, and on that valuation being placed before the Joint High Commission on their re-assembling in Washington, the American representatives made an offer to Sir Louis Davies, then Minister of Marine and Fisheries, that our sealers should retain their vessels and outfits and receive from the United States the sum of $450,000 for the loss of their business. On the recommendation of Sir Louis Davies the sealers of Victoria agreed to accept this amount, but the agreement was not carried out, because a discussion arose as to the delimitation of the Alaska boundary on which the commissioners could not agree. Diplomatic negotiations dragged on for some years, and the Victoria sealers in the meantime at the instigation, or at all events with the full knowledge of the Canadian Government, continued to send out a few vessels from Victoria every year for the purpose of keeping the question alive pending the final settlement of the question of compensation with the United States.

In 1909 the question of the abolition of ocean sealing was taken up again, with the result that the Imperial authorities in March of that year sought the opinion of the Canadian Government, who replied on March 20 through Earl Grey, then Governor General of Canada, that they would be willing to agree to such abolition on condition that compensation be paid to the Canadian sealers by the United States. In January, 1909, the British Ambassador at Washington, writing to the Governor General of the day, as to communications with the United States Government, speaks of compensation being paid to Canada in consideration of the discontinuance of sealing by the British Columbia vessels for a certain period. Now manifestly the only reason that Canada has received this $200,000, which is a first payment of the amount she is to receive during the period of fifteen years under the agreement, is that somebody is to be compensated for the loss of business brought about by the observance of these regulations. This money was not given to Canada for the purpose of going into the Canadian treasury. It was given for the purpose of enabling this Government to compensate the people engaged in the sealing industry.

Two months after this date, in 1909, Earl Grey cabled to the Secretary of State for the Colonies, as follows:

> In answer to your telegram March 27, Ministers adhere to position that they are ready to enter into agreement for suspension of pelagic sealing on condition that compensation will be given to Canadian sealers by the United States, who are owners of Pribyloff and other islands known as seal rookeries.

Later on in that year, the Governor-General, when in Victoria, was waited upon by a deputation of sealers in regard to the matter. Earl Grey intimated at that time that he desired to inquire what was the minimum amount the sealers would accept as compensations, and whether they would agree to be paid in instalments extending

over a term of years. The sealers replied that they would accept the sum of $500,000 spread over a term of years, provided the payments bore interest. The Governor General asked them to put these terms in writing. Accordingly this was done in the autumn of 1909, and this understanding was made the basis of the negotiations which culminated in the agreement of 1911.

I am troubling the House with these details for the purpose of endeavouring to satisfy the Government, from information which seems to me to be unquestionable, that were it not for the fact that the Victoria Sealing Company had these vessels and were working in touch with the Canadian Government, giving statements as to what they would be willing to settle for, the negotiations in regard to this matter which terminated in the international arrangement of 1911 would not have been gone on with. It will be noticed in this connection that the suggestion made by Earl Grey was that the terms of compensation were not necessarily based upon a definite specific amount, but, in view of the arrangement which was afterwards made, by which the payments made by the United States Government were to be yearly for a period of fifteen years. His Excellency at that time contemplated that the sealers would receive payments yearly as the payments came from the United States. Matters remained in that position, with the Victoria Sealing Company, owning these vessels, sailing such a number of them as the Canadian Minister of Marine and Fisheries deemed proper for the purpose of keeping their rights. From the further data before us it will be seen that in 1911, when the negotiations were on, the whole question of compensation was coming to a head and the conclusion was to be arrived at as to what the compensation was to be. In that particular year no sealers left Victoria, B.C., because no one knew what was going to be done in the way of settlement, and matters therefore remained in statu quo. It is urged that because in 1910 and 1911 none of these sealing vessels which were at the wharf prepared to go out did go out as a matter of fact, they were not entitled to receive the money. In view of the history I have detailed of the facts and circumstances in connection with this, it will readily be seen that the dealers understanding their position at that time would not have been justified in going out, as they probably would have thrown an apple of discord into the whole question, in view of the negotiations which were going on at Washington. The treaty was entered into on February 7, 1911, and the Pelagic Sealing Treaty was finally consummated on July 7, 1911. Previous to that, there is on record as a public document a letter which was written by the Prime Minister of the day 'Sir Wilfrid Laurier), now the leader of the Opposition, to Sir Joseph Pope who represented Canada in connection with these negotiations. It is important in a matter of this kind, which does not involve any question of internal politics, but which was more a matter of international arrangement, to see the position taken by the Premier of the day upon the question. He writes to Sir Joseph Pope on May 8, 1911:

Prime Minister's Office, Canada,

Ottawa, May 8, 1911.

Sir:—

The Governor in Council having designated you as the Canadian delegate to the International Conference shortly to meet at Washington, with a view to concerting measures for the protection and preservation of the fur seal in the North Pacific Ocean, I think it well to address to you a few confidential observations for your general guidance.

Canada, having, by separate treaty recently entered into with the United States, accepted the principle involved in assenting to a temporary cessation of Pelagic Sealing within a circumscribed area in return for a pecuniary consideration, your attitude towards proposals for an extension of this agreement to cover the Asiatic side of the North Pacific Ocean should be that taken in the prior negotiations, namely, that Canada is prepared to abstain from the exercise of her undoubted right, only in return for adequate consideration.

You will not fail to impress upon the members of the Conference that Canada's relation towards this differs essentially from that of the United States, Russia, and Japan. They as rookery-owning powers, are naturally desirous to suppress sealing at sea, and thereby enhance the value of their property on land. Canada's interests, on the other hand, lie wholly in the ocean. Any general agreement between the powers for the suppression of pelagic sealing should therefore provide for the admission of Canada to a share in the land-take on the Russian and Japanese Islands. You are aware that in a conference between Russia and Canada, which took place in London in 1904, the Russian government, through its representative, formally declared itself willing to join the United States in making such compensation to Canada.

You will keep me fully informed of the course of the discussions and of the progress of events. Before agreeing to any arrangement of a binding character, you will communicate with me the proposals in which you are invited to concur, and await instruction from this Government.

You are at liberty to show this letter to Mr. Bryce.

I have, &c.,

Wilfrid Laurier.

The doctrine that was at the basis of the negotiations was that Canada should have compensation for the men who
5 p.m. were engaged in the industry. In the Minutes of the Privy Council of Canada of May 10, the following words occur:

> The minister further submits that any agenda paper of this conference should recognize Great Britain's exceptional position as a non-rookery-owning power, by including within the scope of the discussions the question of compensation to Canada for temporarily foregoing pelagic sealing in the interests of the powers owning rookeries.

We come now to the point where the treaty was made, and where this arrangement, involving $7,250,000 for fifteen years, and a payment of $200,000 into the hands of the Canadian Government, was determined upon, for the purpose, not of compensating Canada for anything, because the Canadian Government was not making any particular loss, but her citizens who were engaged in the industry and who were making a loss because they were prevented from further engaging in the industry. It is true the Canadian Government, representing the people of Canada, would be entitled to receive some compensation over and above what went to those who were actually deprived of their occupation, having regard to the fact that others of her citizens would be prevented from engaging in that industry for the balance of the period, but that fact alone does not mean that the Canadian Government should put the money, metaphorically speaking, into its own pocket, and say that those who had been engaged in the industry and created the condition under which it was possible to get this award should not receive a cent. That, however, is the way we are regarding this matter.

The change of government in Canada, coming in 1911, the matter was taken up by the present Minister of Marine and Fisheries (Mr. Hazen), who proposed to determine this question by having an inquiry made by Mr. Justice Audette, of the Exchequer Court. It will be remembered that the Victoria Sealing Company, which term I use as covering 43 out of the 46 vessels engaged in the industry—although I think the number of 43 was somewhat decreased before the inquiry was held—at the period when the compensation was fixed by the United States Government, comprising nine-tenths of the people engaged in the industry, were continuously pressing the matter upon the attention of the Government and urging their right to be compensated. The course taken by the Government was that on June 10, 1913, they passed on Order in Council, which recited the following important facts:

> Under the Pelagic Sealing Treaty of the 7th of July, 1911, between Great Britain, the United States, Japan, and Russia, the nationals of these countries are prohibited for a period of 15 years, from the 15th of December, 1911, from engaging in Pelagic sealing or the hunting of seal otters in that portion of the North Pacific Ocean north of the 30th Parallel of North Latitude, including the seas of Behring, Kanchatka, Ohkotska, and Japan, beyond three miles from the shore lines of their respective countries, also the ports, harbours, and territory of these nations are closed to any vessel or person for any purpose connected with the Pelagic Sealing in the waters mentioned, during the term of the Treaty. That by the Paris Award regulations of 1893, which were made effective by Imperial and United States legislation in 1894, serious restrictions were imposed upon the operations of British and United States pelagic sealers, which restrictions, it is represented, made the business so unprofitable that several Canadian pelagic sealers and sealing vessels were forced to abandon the industry.

That recital is a most significant one, because the Government, by Order in Council, recognized that the effect of these Paris regulations was to prevent the engaging in the sealing business of those who formed the Victoria Sealing Company and who were the real sealers on the coast. It goes on:

> That certain Canadian citizens claim to have been damnified by the above mentioned treaty and regulations, and to be entitled to compensation:
>
> That it is desirable that a thorough investigation of all claims flowing from or arising out of the Pelagic Sealing Treaty and the Paris regulations aforementioned should be made:
>
> The Minister therefore recommends that Honourable Louis Arthur Audette, Assistant Judge of the Exchequer Court, be appointed a commissioner under chapter 104 of the Revised Statutes of Canada for the purpose of investigating all such claims; that for said purpose he be authorized to receive claims, to take evidence in regard thereto, to hear counsel on behalf of the claimants, if such claimants so desire, as well as on behalf of the Crown, if it be decided that the Crown should be represented by counsel; that the said Commissioner be authorized to visit British Columbia and such other places as he may deem necessary for the purpose hereof, and that as soon as possible thereafter the said commissioner report to the Minister of Marine and Fisheries his proceedings under said commission, together with the evidence and his opinion, having regard to the said treaty and regulations, and the evidence of each case as to what person or persons, if any, is or are entitled to be paid compensation by the Crown for damage resulting from such treaty or regulations, and what amount each of such persons is entitled to be so paid.

It will be noticed that while His Lordship Mr. Justice Audette was created a commissioner under the Inquiries Act, his powers were those simply of making inquiry and reporting to the Government; not of making a decisive award in any way, but simply expressing his opinion. And in the commission which was issued to him he was directed:

> To report to our Minister of Marine and Fisheries of Canada—

Not to the Government.

> —the result of your investigation, together with the evidence taken before you and any opinion you may see fit to express thereon, as provided by the said Order in Council—

The result was that Mr. Justice Audette had power to make inquiry into this matter, which covered a long period and necessarily embraced a lot of detail. As is evidenced by his report, it seems as if every Indian on the coast had put in a claim in connection with this matter, and a perusal of the list of names found in his report indicates that it was eminently proper that some inquiry should be made. The point I wish to make is that I do not think the Order in Council or the commission to Mr. Justice Audette empowered him to deal with this question in such a way as to finally dispose of the rights of those claimants or as to absolutely bind the Government by his decision. His opinion only, upon certain questions, was what the Government desired. He proceeded to make this inquiry. He was appointed in 1913, and he did not report until 1916. Indeed, the correspondence under my hand shows that Sir Charles Hibbert Tupper, counsel for the claimants, the Victoria Sealing Company, never received a copy of the opinion of Mr. Justice Audette until the summer of 1916. The commission came to Victoria in July, 1913, December, 1913, and July, 1914, and it was asserted by the Victoria sealing people, through their representatives, that the learned judge intimated to them early in the inquiry that he regarded their cases as one which entitled them to compensation, and that the matter was one which should be settled upon the broadest grounds of justice and equity and not on purely technical questions of law. Indeed, the Government appointed Mr. Curran of Montreal to act as counsel for them in connection with the inquiry, and in the report of the proceedings, as I am instructed, Mr. Curran made certain statements with reference to the position of these Victoria sealing people who had been the major influence in this industry at all times and had kept in continued touch with the Government from the very beginning of the whole matter. Mr. Curran, at the sitting of the commission in Victoria and referring to the offer of $450,000 to the Victoria Sealing Company in 1898—and let me again recall the fact that Sir Louis Davies conferred with these very people, who claim they should receive some compensation to-day, when he was dealing with Washington at that time and that amount was fixed—Mr. Curran said:

> I think we may infer that it was intended to distribute the money among the owners of the vessels although the Canadian and the United States Governments did not have anything arranged . . . there was always a chance of a slip occurring. . . At any rate the $450,000 was intended to settle the claims of the members of the Sealing Association.

In other words, of the Victoria Sealing Company. Mr. Curran proceeded:

> So the suggestion I made was that the capital of the company would be recouped to themselves for the losses suffered on account of fortuitous circumstances which I submit would be a fair way of settling the matter. It is not my province to go into that question.

The commissioner at that time made the following remarks:

> It was embodied in the blue books that had it not been for the tenacity of the Victoria Sealing Company remaining in existence Canada would not have been in as good a position to make this treaty with the United States. If they were in business before 1894 it makes a much more meritorious case because they have been interfered with in their walk of life—to my mind that is the very crux of the case. . . . It was the Victoria sealers who made it possible for the Canadian Government to have any say in the matter. They would not have any more say only for them than they would have in Mexico if the sealers had never entered into business or if they had been driven out of it. The Canadian Government would not have had any claim under this last treaty—that is the way I look at it, that the sealers were restricted out of the business and now the Government is getting some money out of that business on their account—which the Government would not have gotten in any other way—the sealers ought to be compensated for the loss they were put to. . . I will find that the regulations were most hurtful to the Canadian sealing industry.

There was used in the hearings a rather curious document emanating from the Marine and Fisheries Department which suggested three or four different ways in which this matter could be settled; and it is important, as this is a public document, a copy of which I have, that we should see what was the view presented in the statement of this case by the gentleman who presented it, an official of the department.

This memorandum was prepared by Mr. Found. He says:

At the time this treaty went into effect (1911) the following four Canadian schooners were engaged in pelagic sealing.

And he gives the names.

These vessels were especially adapted for Pelagic sealing and would be of little use for any other purpose, as they are, owing to the treaty, prevented from continuing in their business, the undersigned submits that the owners thereof are entitled to reasonable compensation.

At the same time that these four schooners which, mark you, were sealing contrary to the regulations and in spite of the law which said they should not seal as I remarked before in dealing with this matter. He goes on and speaks of the Victoria Sealing Company as having 35 vessels laid up in the Victoria harbour, and he gives the names of the vesels in detail. Dealing with this question of their being compensated, he says:

Besides the above vessels there were when the Treaty went into effect 37 sealing schooners laid up in Victoria Harbour; 35 of these belonged to the Victoria Sealing Co., one to Mr. Joseph Boscowitz of Victoria and the other to Mr. Jacobson of Victoria. None of these vessels had engaged in sealing since the season of 1909 and many of them not for several years prior to that. All of them were built or purchased and specially arranged for the express purpose of Pelagic Sealing in the waters covered by the Treaty and each of them has operated in these waters. No doubt they were laid up for a time because their operation was not found to pay; but they could have been made ready to engage in the industry at any time that might be deemed expedient. Under the Treaty however, they are precluded during its pendance from being so used and they are not suitable for other work. However, in view of the International negotiations that have been in progress for many years looking to the cessation of Pelagic Sealing in the North Pacific Ocean and Behring Sea the owners of sealing vessels in British Columbia have had reasonable ground for believing that if they retained their vessels they would be ultimately be compensated therefor. One of the matters before the Joint High Commission in 1898 was a proposal for the cessation of Pelagic Sealing. The Commission with a view to ascertaining the value of the fleet appointed two expert valuators, one from Canada and the other from the United States to go to Victoria and after a through examination of the vessels place a value on them. The Canadian expert valued the entire British Columbia fleet at $1.35 per ton register.

Under all these circumstances the undersigned is of opinion that the owners of these vessels are entitled to compensation though not to the same extent as the owners of those that were actively engaged in the business when the Treaty became effective.

He goes on further to deal with this question.

From a straight business standpoint, in view of the above, it might be urged that the company is really entitled to compensation, as sealing was engaged in because those who went into the industry thought they could make money, and when they ceased to do so, they retired from the field, but it must not be overlooked that the conditions in the present instance are anomalous. In the first place, though there has been no definite promise of compensation to the sealers there has ever since the Joint High Commission in 1898 and for some years before, been a feeling on the part of the sealers that if they would hold on they would be compensated to go out of business.

This is the report of the official of the Marine and Fisheries Department.

And therefore morally there is in the opinion of the undersigned no question but that the company should receive compensation, and that such should be as generous as possible, compatible with conditions.

Then he goes on, and the curious thing about this memoranda is that apparently he prepares three different kinds of reports, making three different recommendations as to the value to be paid.

Mr. BURRELL: What is the date of that?

Mr. MACDONALD: July 7, 1911. It will be noted that that report of Mr. Found was made practically at the time of entering into the treaty, and therefore is of more significance, because those were the conditions under which the treaty was entered into, with the full knowledge and belief that these gentlemen composing the company were going to get compensation. A specific recommendation which he made in regard to that reads:

Article 11 of the Treaty provides for an advance payment by the United States to Great Britain of $200,000 on account of seal skins to which Great Britain is entitled under the Treaty. This money has already been paid over to Canada and can be made available by authority of your Royal Highness for the payment of compensation to those damnified by the Treaty. No doubt the object in securing such advanced payment was to enable the necessary compensation to be paid without drawing on the treasury.

In the opinion of the undersigned, in the light of the conditions obtaining such sum will provide liberal compensation to those directly affected by the Treaty and should not therefore be exceeded.

The undersigned has therefore the honour to recommend:

(1) That compensation be paid out of the $200,000 received from the United States government under the Treaty and that the total amount paid in such connection do not exceed that sum.

He varies that recommendation by a more liberal interpretation in another part of the report, which I will not read to the House. I am quoting from Mr. Found's statement in regard to the matter, because it proves conclusively that the Government officials in Canada, who had everything to do with the question of working out this treaty arrangement, recognize unequivocally, as between man and man, according to the principles of morality, equity, and justice as administered by a court of law, that the Victoria Sealing Company were entitled, upon that basis, to receive compensation. There can be no manner of doubt about that.

Now, Mr. Justice Audette acting as a commissioner, finally made a report on this matter, after long delay, on the 10th day of January, 1916. It is complained on behalf of the sealing company, and on behalf of Sir Hibbert Tupper, that the first knowledge he received of the finding of Mr. Justice Audette or his opinion rather, was some statement in a fishing magazine, at any rate, it was not until the summer of last year that they were able to get the document printed in answer to a return in this House. He deals with the various classes of cases that were submitted to him. He divides that classification submitted to him into four. Therefore, it may be stated that he disposes of the sum of $60,000 out of $200,000, but he declines to give any sum to the sealing company as compensation, notwithstanding the facts I have mentioned in detail to the House in regard to the whole question. He says:

> Having thus passed in review the general heads of complaint put forward by the sealers against the regulations, and approaching the consideration of this claim in a spirit of justice connoting the idea of doing what in equity and good conscience is fair and just, and after giving this branch of the commission special care and labour, as it involved both large amounts and a large number of claimants, I have come to the conclusion and find that the Canadian sealers are not entitled to be paid any compensation by the Crown for alleged damage resulting from the said regulations.

Of course, his opinion is nothing more than an opinion, because no jurisdiction, authority, or power, was conferred upon Judge Audette to make any final decision in the matter. It is in accordance with that opinion, which was afterwards affirmed by an Order in Council made by the Government last year, that I appeal to the Government and this House to look into this matter, and deal with it upon the broadest principles, and upon the most generous lines.

It seems to me that one cannot look over these facts presented here and say that the Government can be doing their full duty if they disregard the fact that this money came into their hands simply as trustees for Canadian citizens.

It is not the money of the Government of Canada; the Government holds it in trust for those who were entitled to compensation and who were damnified in any way by the operation of these regulations.

The learned judge based his conclusion that the Victoria Sealing Company was not entitled to compensation upon several grounds. First, he said that the provisions of the Paris regulations were analogous to any other restrictions imposed upon an industry by a State for the benefit of all those engaged in the industry. He says in effect that the men engaged in the sealing industry have no more right to complain of the Paris regulations than men engaged in the salmon or lobster industry have a right to complain about a change made in the fishing season. I submit that that is very narrow ground to take on an international question. To say that matters affecting the interests of people engaged in this international industry should be settled on the same basis as matters affecting people engaged in an industry such as lobster fishing, which is carried on only during certain months of the year, is hardly taking broad grounds. I do not think that Sir John Thompson, Lord Justice Hannen, Sir Charles Russell and Sir Charles Hibbert Tupper, when they sat in Paris and promulgated these regulations, were looking at this matter from that viewpoint. Matters affecting those engaged in this international industry ought to be settled on the same high plane as that taken by the plenipotentiaries of the great powers who met first in Paris and afterwards in Washington.

The learned judge stated as a second reason for his conclusion that the Paris regulations did not provide for any compensation to the sealers. This was primarily the reason why the Canadian Government insisted at the 1911 conference at Washington that the compensation should be given. It was because these Paris regulations provided for no compensation that Sir John Thompson objected to their being put in operation. The Government of the day, as shown in the letter that I read from the then Prime Minister, Sir Joseph Pope, pointed out that no arrangement could be made except on the basis of compensation. These

Paris regulations were passed in the interests of the United States sealing people. When in 1911 the matter was being dealt with, it was suggested that, the industry having suffered on account of these regulations, some compensation should be provided.

The learned judge, in his opinion, said further that the sealers had no legal rights that could be enforced against the Crown. That, of course, is a legal truism. But the relation between Sovereign and subject is put very clearly in the illuminating judgments given in England in a case having relation to a treaty under which money was to be similarly disposed of. The judgments are those of Chief Justice Cockburn and Mr. Justice Lush in the well-known case of Rustomjee vs. the Queen in the Exchequer Court of England, and, on appeal, of Lord Chief Justice Coleridge. Chief Justice Cockburn said:

> The effect of the . . . treaty—

He is referring not to the Pelagic Sealing Treaty, but to another.

> —is . . . simply this, that it places the fund at the disposition of Her Majesty for Her Majesty at her discretion to cause distribution of it to be made as shall make good the claims which her subjects have against the foreigner from whose Government the money is received.

Mr. Justice Lush said:

> No doubt a duty arose as soon as the money was received to distribute that money amongst the persons towards whose losses it was paid . . . ; the distribution when made would be the act of a sovereign in dispensing justice to her subjects. . . For any omission of that duty the sovereign cannot be held responsible. The responsibility would rest with the advisers of the Crown, and they are responsible to Parliament and to Parliament alone.

And lastly on appeal, Lord Chief Justice Coleridge said:

> We do not doubt that on the payment of the money . . . there was a duty on the part of the English Sovereign to administer the money so received according to the stipulations of the treaty. But it was a duty to do justice to her subjects according to the advice of her responsible ministers.

These are the principles upon which funds of this kind were disposed of, according to English decision; and these are the principles which should guide the Canadian Government in dealing with this question. I again assert that the money which the Government have received and which they will receive from time to time during the next fifteen years is not the property of the Government of Canada per se; it is in their possession as trustees along the line of the decisions to which I have referred.

It must be borne in mind that if it had not been for the Victoria Sealing Company, the Canadian Government would have had no claim to compensation. Besides those owned by the company, only four vessels, operated by Japanese and Indians, were engaged in the sealing industry in British Columbia, in defiance of the regulations. I have pointed out that in 1911 the 35 vessels of the company were tied up at the wharf, prevented from sealing on account of these regulations. Had it not been for that fact, the Government of Great Britain would have had no case for compensation in the negotiations at Washington, because there would have been nobody to compensate.

With regard to the opinion of Mr. Justice Audette, I wish to read a telegram sent by Sir Charles Hibbert Tupper to the Minister of Marine and Fisheries from Vancouver on May 20, 1913. It is as follows:

> Telegraphic report of Commission re sealers in effect bars out all claims save those affected by treaty 1911. Kindly wire if scope not intended to include the claims of those affected by regulations under Behring Sea Award.

To which the minister replied, on May 21, 1913:

> Telegraphic report incorrect. Commission will enquire into validity of claims under Behring Sea Award and report to Government as to whether or not such claims should be entertained.

So that it was the intention of the commission to consider these claims and to have a report upon them. Then there is various correspondence in which Sir Charles Hibbert Tupper as counsel for the sealers complains that he was not advised as to the filing of the report; that not until it had been brought down in the House last year, during the midsummer, and finally printed had he received a copy.

On February 28, 1916 an Order in Council was passed approving of the opinion given by Mr. Justice Audette. Sir Charles Hibbert Tupper came to Ottawa and on November 1, 1916 he advised the Victoria Sealing Company as follows:

> During my visit in Ottawa I had a conversation with the Prime Minister and all I can say is that he seemed favourably disposed, so far as he was personally concerned, to allow a rehearing, but felt it would be necessary to convince the Minister of Marine that the sealers' request be complied with. I think I have already told you the idea the Minister of Marine entertained, viz.: that Audette made an award or a judgment and that this was final.
>
> I think I successfully pointed out to the Prime Minister that this was not a proper view; that by the Order in Council and Com-

mission Audette was appointed a commissioner to take evidence and if he saw fit, to report with the evidence his opinion.

It would be unfortunate, in a case of this kind, if the Government or the Minister of Marine and Fisheries undertook to hold that Mr. Justice Audette's report on this matter was in the nature of a judgment which was final. It can be readily seen, from the Order in Council which I read and from the commission issued to Mr. Justice Audette, that it was not intended that he should dispose of the matter in the same way as a court would dispose of it, and in the second place, it would be most unfair to those gentlemen who had created a case for the Government in this international matter which had formed the subject of consideration at Paris and Washington, if they were to be told here: There is no appeal from this inquiry; we, the trustees for this money, will not listen to a request from you to be classed as a cestui que trust; we have created a tribunal, and although your claims are based upon the broadest grounds of justice, equity and fair play, yet, we will not consider those matters upon that basis, and we will simply hang upon the decision of Mr. Justice Audette upon the point, and let the matter stand.

The result was that on the 21st of November, 1916, Mr. Adams of the Victoria Sealing Company wrote to the Minister of Marine and Fisheries, as follows:

On the 26th of April last the Victoria Sealing Company, Ltd., sent you a protest against the findings of Mr. Justice Audette regarding the Sealing Commission, for which he was appointed commissioner. A reply to the petition that a rehearing of the matter be given has never been received by this company, although the shareholders have been anxiously looking for it all this time. Would you kindly let us know whether the petition for a rehearing is to be granted, or whether it is refused.

To this letter the deputy Minister of the Naval Service replied on November 29:

I beg to acknowledge your letter of the 22nd ultimo, calling attention to the protest of the Victoria Sealing Company, Limited, against the findings of Mr. Justice Audette in connection with the Pelagic sealing claims, and the request for a hearing in the way of appeal before the Governor in Council or otherwise.

In reply, I am directed to state that as the claimants were given full opportunity to substantiate their claims before the commissioner, and the award was made in the light of the evidence submitted, it has been decided after careful consideration of the matter, to accept the award of Mr. Justice Audette as a final closing of the case.

Then there is this letter written on December 16 by the Victoria Sealing Company to the deputy Minister of the Naval Service:

Re Victoria Sealing Company.

Sir:—

I beg to acknowledge your letter of the 29th November, 1916. I observe you state that the award was made in the light of evidence submitted and that it has been decided to accept "the award of Mr. Justice Audette" as a final closing of the case. I desire respectfully to call attention to what may possibly have been overlooked in this connection, namely: there has been no award. In this connection I refer to the Order in Council of the 10th June, 1913, which appointed Louis Arthur Audette, assistant judge of the Exchequer Court, "a Commissioner under Chapter 104 of the Revised Statutes of Canada for the purpose of investigating all such claims . . . and that as soon as possible thereafter the said commissioner do report to the Minister of Marine and Fisheries his proceedings under said Commission together with the evidence and his opinion."

I also refer to the Commission which appoints Audette "to be our Commissioner to conduct such enquiry," and again: 'We do hereby require and direct you, our said Commissioner, to report to our Minister of Marine and Fisheries of Canada the result of your investigation together with the evidence taken before you, and any opinion you may see fit to express thereon."

Counsel for the Crown on the opening of the Commission stated he had been "requested by the Dominion Government to represent the Government upon the discussion of these claims before the Commissioner." He added: "I may say at the outset that the Government does not recognize any legal obligation or technical liability"; and again he stated that as a representative of the Government together with those who represented the claimants he hoped they would be able to "give Your Lordship something upon which to base your report and finally to enable the Government to satisfy the claims and compensate those who have been injured by these international enactments."

The Commissioner also on the same occasion said: "I think we have gone beyond the question of liability or rather of legal liability. We know there is no legal liability. My idea is to do what in equity and good conscience would suggest itself. You are more in the bounty and grace of the Crown here than anything else. But you must show some reason why you make a claim and you must have some reason which would appeal to any one on a question of justice and equity.

In matters of much smaller importance when Mr. Justice Audette is acting in the capacity of a judge, there is a provision for an appeal to a higher tribunal, and since in this case he was simply appointed to take the evidence for the information of the Government, and if he deemed fit, to express an opinion, the Victoria Sealing Company, Limited, ventures to press its claim that before the case is finally closed those interested may be permitted to show cause why his opinion should not be adopted by the Government.

To this letter the deputy minister replied at a later date, and, quoting from the Order in Council, said:

In accordance with this, the Commissioner submitted his report and gave his opinion as to

the persons entitled to be paid compensation and the amount of such compensation. The Government, after consideration of his report and findings, approved of them by Order in Council of the 28th of February last, and since then those entitled to compensation have received it. As I previously informed you, it has been decided to accept the disposal of the claims that has been made as a final closing of the matter.

Later on, as a result of the intervention of Sir Charles Hibbert Tupper on the question, the Prime Minister wrote to Mr. Adams, the secretary-treasurer of the Victoria Sealing Company, on January 6, 1917:

In reply to your letter of the 22nd November last I beg to say that the report of Mr. Justice Audette and the petition for rehearing had been referred to the Hon. Arthur Meighen, Solicitor General, for report.

I have given the facts in the record as they come before me, and apparently the matter is in this position: that the Government have referred it to the Solicitor General for report. I am not here to criticise, and I do not wish to be understood as doing anything but putting before the House and the Government the case in regard to a very important international matter, and to ask the Government to take it into their very serious consideration, because it is a matter that has been the subject of consideration of three international tribunals. We had, first, the Paris tribunal of 1893; then we had the conference in Quebec in 1898, and then we had the final adjustment in 1911, all being based, so far as I can judge from those documents, upon the fact that the Victoria Sealing Company were, in the first instance, the major people in the industry; that they were paid compensation at one period on account of the regulations interfering with them, and that at this later period they were unquestionably prevented from engaging in their business by reason of the regulations based upon the Paris award. Were it not for the fact that they were damaged by reason of the operation of those regulations, the Canadian Government would not have had a case to obtain a single dollar from the American Government, with the exception of what they might have had for those four other isolated vessels which were fishing illegally. It is a curious way in which to dispose of an international trust, to provide for a payment of money to men who disregard the international agreement and fail to compensate those who observed the regulations to which the good faith of the country was pledged, who kept in touch with the Government of the day from time to time, and who dealt with the situation, having regard to those principles upon which international matters should be dealt with.

I submit that the Government ought to regard this question as still open, and take such course as they may deem fit. Once they recognize the existence is a valid claim they should assess what would be considered reasonable damages. The Victoria Sealing Company simply asks that the Government of Canada shall keep faith with them, and that the compensation agreed to in 1898 through Sir Louis Davies, again agreed to in 1909 with Earl Grey, and admitted to be their just due in 1913 by Mr. F. Curran, Crown counsel, before the Royal Commission, shall be paid to them by the Government of Canada as the funds come in from time to time. The company only recently discovered after a long period of time that the Order in Council had been passed.

So the matter stands this way: The Canadian Government, having been entrusted by the Imperial Government for the first time in history with the conduct of negotiations involving a question of foreign policy and justice as between the Crown and its subjects, has exploited the injuries of British subjects to obtain on behalf of those subjects compensation amounting to $7,250,000, and having from time to time over a period of twenty years, by words and acts, given those subjects to understand that they would be fairly and equitably compensated, now turns round like a defaulting trustee and denies any part of that compensation to those on whose behalf they received it.

Had the reasons given in the report of the commissioner been contained in a judgment in a case between subject and subject, there would have been a right of appeal where the grounds of the decision could have been reviewed. That appeal could only turn on the broad principles on which this matter ought to be determined, and not upon any narrow ground, not upon any technical provision of law.

It does seem to me that it would be a disgrace to Canada if, after our dealings on this question with the various nations interested, after utilizing this particular company as one institution which gave us the right to compensation, we should turn round and say to that company: We will pay you nothing because you cannot sue the Crown. The Government should proceed upon the broad principles laid down by Lord Chief Justice Coleridge and the

other justices in England in connection with the other treaty to which I have referred. The Government should act in a manner comporting with the dignity of the sources from which this money comes, and comporting with the dignity of the distinguished men who carried on these negotiations. I ask from the Government, who are the custodians of this money, consideration of the request of this company, which I have endeavoured to present, not with any harshness or in any spirit of criticism, but simply as a case which I believe deserves the fairest possible consideration from the Government.

At six o'clock the House took recess.

After Recess.

The House resumed at eight o'clock.

Hon. MARTIN BURRELL (Minister of Agriculture): At six o'clock the hon. member for Pictou (Mr. Macdonald) had just finished presenting to the House a question of some interest, a question which has been discussed here on one or two other occasions. He asked the Government for further consideration of the matter in so far as it conferred a compensation on certain parties to whom he thought compensation should be given. The minister concerned and his department gave very careful consideration to this whole subject, before Mr. Commissioner Audette was appointed to investigate the question and also after that appointment; and they have also given very careful attention to the findings of Mr. Justice Audette, and in those findings they concur. The Minister of Marine and Fisheries (Mr. Hazen) regrets not being here, and has asked me to deal with the matter in his absence. The hon. member for Pictou has argued that as a result of the Pelagic Sealing Treaty of 1911, a large sum of money will accrue to the treasury of this country, money which does not strictly belong to the people of the country generally, but which should be directed simply as a matter of compensation to those who have been engaged in the seal industry for many years prior to the treaty. He spoke particularly of the Victoria Sealing Company as being the parties chiefly interested. He has pointed out that they were not compensated, whereas the four or five other vessels which were, according to his assertion, sealing illegally at that time were compensated. In the first place, I can hardly agree with either of these contentions of my hon. friend. I do not wish to take up the time of the House in traversing the whole history of the matter, interesting as it is, but I want to touch on one or two points which, unless explained, might not be as clear to the House.

The United States acquired the Pribiloff islands as a part of Alaska, by purchase from Russia in 1867. Five years later she gave a lease for twenty years to the Alaska Commercial Company of the exclusive sealing rights on these islands. At that time and for some years afterwards there was no pelagic sealing of importance, so the lessees had a monopoly of the industry, resulting in very large profits to them, as well as to the lessors, the United States Government. In the early eighties some Canadians took up pelagic sealing in a more consistent way, and as good profits were made the industry soon grew. The lesses and the United States Government, seeing formidable competitors appearing, tried to stop them. The United States Government took the ground that Behring Sea is mare clausum and that as the seals were born and spent an important portion of each year on their islands, they were actually their property. In 1886, acting on the assumption that Behring Sea was a closed sea, they seized some Canadian sealing vessels in that sea many miles from land. The House will recall the diplomatic negotiations which followed at that time. No seizures were made the following year, but as pelagic sealing kept on growing, further seizures were effected in 1888 and in 1889. Vigorous diplomatic correspondence ensued, and in 1891 a modus vivendi was entered into, with a view to preventing further overt acts during negotiating, by which Behring Sea was closed to pelagic sealing and land killing was restricted to the number required to provide food for the natives on the islands, seal meat forming an important portion of their food. This modus vivendi was continued in 1892. The negotiations finally resulted in an agreement to submit the whole question to arbitration, which arbitration took place in Paris in 1893. A condition of the arbitration was that the question of the natural history of the seal should be considered with a view to the proper protection of the herds. Canada's contentions were absolutely upheld. Pelagic sealing was vindicated as a legal method of hunting, and the United States was required to pay heavy damages for the seizures and interference made; but regulations for the protection of the seals, since known as the Paris award regulations were also

provided by the arbitrators. These regulations restricted the use of fire-arms to rifles outside of Behring Sea, and prohibited the use of fire-arms altogether in such sea, and also provided a close season for Behring Sea during the months of May, June and July.

During the first year the regulations were in operation there was a very large catch of seals, but every year subsequently the catch diminished very rapidly. It was obvious to everybody who studied the history of seal life that the regulations could only retard the extinction of the sealing industry, and it was very questionable whether they could permanently save it if pelagic sealing was followed. I need not go into the reasons except to mention that the killing of the seals on the rookeries enables the killers to select the male seals, whereas in the pelagic sealing there must be indiscriminate killing of the females as well as the males, and in the end the absolute extinction of the whole industry. As I have stated, the industry began to fail rapidly after 1894, and fell into such a bad way that British Columbia sealers got together and finally in 1900, formed what is known as the Victoria Sealing Company, because they realized that if all the sealing vessels which were then in existence went out in the indiscriminate loose way they were then going out, the whole business would be put an end to in a very short time. At that time there were 46 British Columbia sealing vessels, of which 43 were embraced in the Victoria Sealing Company. Year by year fewer vessels were sent out. In 1904 only 16 vessels were sent out by the company; in 1908, 4 vessels; in 1909, one vessel; and subsequently none. So that for two years before the treaty of 1911 was effected the Victoria Sealing Company had ceased to be a factor in the industry. While the Victoria Sealing Company dropped out of the business entirely after 1909, a few independent British Columbia boats continued in it.

Had it not been for the continuation of these few boats in the industry, carrying on active sealing operation, there practically would have been no reason for the United States entering into this treaty of 1911, so far as Canada is concerned. It was therefore obvious that the best interests of all concerned would be served if an arrangement could be made by which the non-rookery-owning powers—the powers that had not an interest in the land operations of sealing—could fairly share in the business and have pelagic sealing done away with altogether. To this end, negotiations were taken up and resulted in the eminently satisfactory treaty which we are now discussing, of July 7, 1911, by which Canada receives 15 per cent of the gross number of skins taken on the United States and Russian sea islands, and 10 per cent of those taken on the shore islands, without incurring any expense as to the management of the herds. The treaty also provided for an advance payment of $200,000 on account of the skins which Canada would be entitled to under it, the object, no doubt, being to pay compensation to be paid under the treaty without drawing on the treasury. The treaty is for a term of 15 years, but it is expected that it will be continued indefinitely thereafter.

Following the adoption of the treaty, claims for compensation began to pour in, not only on account of it but also owing to the Paris award regulations, and for various other reasons. It was finally decided by the Government to appoint Mr. Justice Audette of the Exchequer Court a commissioner to investigate all claims flowing from or arising out of the pelagic sealing treaty of 1911, as also arising out of the Paris award regulations of 1894. His instructions will be found in the Order in Council passed appointing him. Some 1,605 claims amounting to over $9,000,000, were submitted to Mr. Justice Audette, and in order that the claims might be properly investigated without avoidable trouble or expense to the claimants, Judge Audette went to Victoria, British Columbia, and also to Halifax and Sydney and Ottawa, holding meetings at each place. Evidence under oath was submitted and counsel was employed by the Government to see that its interests were properly considered, as well as by the claimants with regard to the claims under the Paris award regulations, among which were those of the Victoria Sealing Company. The commissioner found they could not be paid, and he concluded his reasons for so finding in the following words:

> It is conceded by all parties that the sealers have no legal claim. Their claims do not originate in tort, as in the case of the illegal seizure of the vessels under the British flag in 1886. This commission originated absolutely in the benevolence, grace and bounty of the Crown; and while I am not here holding the scale of justice on strict legal rights, but with rights emanating from equity and good conscience, I am unable to find that the sealers were in any manner injured and damaged by the regulations that would entitle them to compensation. It would be contrary to the prin-

ciples of natural justice to declare these claimants entitled to recover, where no pretence of right in law, equity or good conscience (ex aequo et bono) has been made out.

It has been contended that because the nation is recovering a large amount in consideration for the entering into the treaty of 1911, a monetary condition which would never have been obtained but for the regulations which kept the seals alive up to that time, that the sealers should recover. A most erroneous view to take under the circumstances. Whatever amount is recoverable—or recovered—under the treaty, forms a national fund absolutely at the disposal of the sovereign under constitutional principles, and which falls into the Canadian exchequer, and it is not even in any way earmarked to compensate the sealers under the treaty of 1911, and indeed, asserted with much more certitude not to compensate under the regulations which were made under the Paris Award in 1893 and which did not provide for the payment of any money but only sought the protection of the herd.

If the Government were using moneys derived from the treaty of 1911, as claimed by some counsel, to pay the claimants under the regulations—moneys coming from two countries that had nothing to do with the regulations would thus be used. Hence it could not be done.

Having thus passed in review the general heads of complaint put forward by the sealers against the regulations, and approaching the consideration of this claim in a spirit of justice connoting the idea of doing what in equity and good conscience is fair and just, and after giving this branch of the commission special care and labour, as it involved both large amounts and a large number of claimants, I have come to the conclusion and find that the Canadian sealers are not entitled to be paid any compensation by the Crown for alleged damage resulting from the said regulations.

The commissioner found that the only persons entitled to compensation were those who were engaged in the industry in 1911, with certain minor exceptions, such as hunters who were prevented from hunting in that year, owing to sickness or otherwise; also, the ships which were engaged in that year. The total amount of the compensation awarded was $60,663.75. The commissioner's report was approved, and these claims have been paid and it has been decided not to re-open the question. It is curious to note, as showing the arguments which appealed also to the Japanese Government, that in compensating their claimants they dealt only with those men who were actually engaged in the industry when the treaty came into eeffct in 1911. It is quite obvious that this large fund, which, we hope, will accrue to the country from the preservation of these seal herds, belongs, not in particular to one person or another who may at one time or another have been engaged in the sealing industry, but belongs to the people of Canada in recognition of a right which they had to conduct pelagic sealing, and because that right has been extinguished or is abolished—has been given up by the whole people of Canada—therefore Canada is entitled to the compensation, and not those individuals who may have been engaged in the industry at one time but who, on account of regulations and conditions which were established to preserve the seal industry, and without which the industry would have become extinct, were compelled to abandon the industry. The Government therefore decided that the only people strictly entitled to any compensation are those who, at the time of the affirming of this treaty, were actually engaged in the business, and to whom, therefore, the contracting parties had to say: You cannot conduct sealing operations any longer.

With respect to the gentlemen of whom my hon. friend spoke to-day, it can only be again observed that they actually, by the conditions which existed at that time, had gone out of the business entirely two years prior to the contracting parties entering into that treaty. I can add nothing further than to say that this is the view taken by the minister and the department and the view generally taken by the Government. I cannot give my hon. friend any assurance that the Government would think it right, wise or advisable, after the whole matter has been thoroughly gone into by Mr. Justice Audette, a special commissioner who heard all evidence presented on behalf of the claimants and who had made a certain report, to appoint another commission to investigate the work of Mr. Justice Audette. We feel that he dealt with it fairly and justly, and, on the whole, the Government feel that it must adhere to that report.

Right Hon. Sir WILFRID LAURIER: My hon. friend (Mr. Burrell) who has charge of this department in the absence of the Minister of Naval Affairs concluded his observations by stating that he could not give any assurance that the Government would take into its favourable consideration the claim put forth this afternoon by the hon. member for Pictou (Mr. Macdonald) on behalf of the sealers of British Columbia. My hon. friend from Pictou did not expect any assurance to that effect to-day, but I still express the hope that the consideration of the Government will be more favourable in the future in regard to this question. It is impossible to deal fairly with this question, in my judgment, if we deal simply upon the strict letter of the Treaty of 1911. In order to do full

justice to the whole question on behalf of the people of Canada and of the sealers of British Columbia, I think it is imperative that we should go very much beyond the Treaty of 1893 which resulted in the passing of the regulations which are at the source of all the complaints we have now to deal with. Up to 1873 there was no such thing as pelagic sealing. As stated by my hon. friend, when the Pribyloff Islands belonged to Russia, and after their acquisition by the United States, the method of taking the seals was to kill them on the land. I am prepared to concede that perhaps this method was more conducive to the maintenance of the herd than any other. But my hon. friend will grant that the seal belongs to everybody, and not to one class of people in particular. In 1873, when some enterprising Canadians in British Columbia undertook to go into what was known as pelagic sealing—that is the hunting of the seals on the high seas—they were absolutely within their rights. This industry became profitable. But the possessor of Pribyloff island, the American Government, and the lessees of the American Government, looked upon the pelagic sealers as intruders, interlopers and trespassers. The habits of these seals are peculiar. They live in the high seas in winter and resort to the land in May, June and July for breeding purposes. When August comes they disperse again to the ocean and come back to the island the following spring. When they were dispersed on the ocean the British Columbia sealers pursued. In this, as I have said these sealers were perfectly within their right, and the only objection which was made was that pelagic sealing tended to deplete the herds. As stated by my hon. friend the objection was that the sealers who killed on the land destroyed only the young males, whereas on the high seas not only the young males but also the females were killed. But, as the pelagic sealers were absolutely within their rights, the protest of the American owners of the islands did not impress them. As has been stated by my hon. friend, in 1886 the American authorities chose to seize several of the sealers. They claimed, as has been stated by my hon. friend from Pictou (Mr. Macdonald) and repeated by the hon. Minister of Agriculture (Mr. Burrell) that the Behring sea, where the seizures took place, belonged to the United States. This contention was rejected by the commission, and rightly so. I believe upon this point that the commission were unanimous. If I remember rightly the American counsel claimed that pelagic sealing ought to be altogether forbidden. The tribunal did not agree to this, but simply passed certain regulations to limit the pelagic sealing, and make it more difficult. These regulations were four in number. First, a close season was established lasting, if I remember well, from May to August or September. There was a shoal of sixty miles along Pribilof island where the seals breed. A zone was established around this shoal within which pelagic sealing was absolutely prohibited. Then, the use of certain weapons was prohibited; and, lastly, the use of steam vessels was also forbidden. With these restrictions—the season, the zone, the weapon, and the vessels—the operation of the sealers was greatly limited, and undoubtedly they suffered damage. There cannot be a shadow of a doubt that they suffered damage. They made complaints and representations to the Canadian Government. I may observe to my hon. friend that, if the award was unanimous as to the right of Canadians to engage in pelagic sealing, the award which established these regulations was not unanimous. Sir John Thompson, the appointee of the Canadian Government on the Board, did not agree to this part of the award. The fact that a man of the eminent authority of Sir John Thompson would not agree to these regulations is a very strong point on behalf of the sealers, and it is, to my mind, conclusive evidence that the sealers had a just cause of complaint when these regulations were made. Therefore, it will be easily understood why the sealers made complaint to the Canadian Government representing that they had been unfairly dealt with, and were entitled to compensation. That was in 1893. The matter was taken into consideration by the government of that day, but no conclusion was arrived at. In 1898, when the Joint High Commission was appointed to settle many questions that were then pending between Canada and the United States—the Atlantic Fisheries, the Alaskan Boundary and others—this question of the seals was taken up by the Government. The Canadian representative brought the matter to the attention of his fellow-members of the commission, and claimed compensation for the British Columbian sealers. It is to be observed that the fairness of this claim was not disputed by the American commissioner; on the contrary, it was accepted as fair, and witnesses were examined by the commission to ascertain what would be the amount of compensation to which the Brit-

ish Columbia sealers might be fairly entitled. The matter, however, did not reach a conclusion, because the commission adjourned, and took up the consideration of the Alaskan boundary question, and the sealing question was never resumed. The matter stood where it was. The British Columbian sealers never ceased to make complaint to the Government, representing that they were entitled to compensation for the loss of their industry.

In 1909, when the Canadian Government was approached by the United States Government on the subject of the entire suspension of pelagic sealing, the Canadian Government agreed to the suspension of pelagic sealing for fifteen years, but only upon the condition that compensation should be given to Canada for the loss of the right which she was sacrificing.

Mr. BURRELL: Was that in 1909?

Sir WILFRID LAURIER: Yes. The commission was appointed in 1910, if I remember rightly, and the final treaty was passed in July, 1911. It was stipulated as an absolute condition by the Canadian Government for the giving up of the privilege of pelagic sealing that compensation should be afforded, and that condition was accepted by the United States authorities. Generous terms of compensation were granted; fifteen per cent of the value of the catch of seals killed on land, and an immediate advance of $200,000. What was the object of this compensation? My hon. friend says that it was a consideration for Canada's giving up her right to use the high seas for pelagic sealing. But Canada would not, for a sum of money, have given up such a right as that upon the high seas. The Canadian Government could not have been blind to the fact that people were engaged in that industry; that the industry had been seriously damaged year after year by the regulations which had for their object the restricting of pelagic sealing. It is not to be wondered at, therefore, that the Canadian Government could not ignore the claim of these men who had been engaged in pelagic sealing and whose rights had been so restricted. For my part, I always thought that the best way of investing this money would be to compensate the men who had suffered from these regulations. These men who built schooners and manned and equipped them for use in pelagic sealing were absolutely within their rights; they were absolutely as free as anybody else was on the high seas. Suddenly the Canadian Government said: You shall not carry on your trade any longer. The commissioner who was appointed, Mr. Justice Audette—a man of eminent ability, I admit; a man upon whose judgment I rely—

Mr. BURRELL: Before my hon. friend leaves that point, may I ask him whether he has considered what would have happened if the sealing had been carried on after 1911 as it was from 1895 down to 1911? The evidence is that if there had been no treaty, these people would have been put out of business by the absolute extinction of the seal herds.

Sir WILFRID LAURIER: The result of these regulations was to make the business less profitable, and the sealers who had organized themselves into a corporation went less and less into the business. It is said that for three or four years before 1911 they had ceased to send schooners out on the high seas. But they never ceased to make application for compensation in respect of the damage that these restrictions had caused to them. If they went out of business, what was the reason? Simply that the regulations had made sealing unprofitable. That is to say, they suffered in consequence of the regulations imposed upon them.

Mr. BURRELL: That may be so, but if these regulations—which, after all, have had some effect in preserving the herds—had not been enforced, the sealers would have gone out of business sooner, because no seals would have been left.

Sir WILFRID LAURIER: Many industries which have flourished for a time in newly discovered districts have in the course of time exhausted their material. The ore of many a mine has become or may yet become exhausted, and when exhausted no claim can be made from the state; but if while there is ore in the mine the miner is prohibited from working by the state, the latter receiving profits from the prohibition, the miner, out of the profits derived by the state, ought to receive compensation. So in this case. These men were exercising a right. Possibly in the course of time the sealing would have been exhausted; I am very much afraid that a great deal of our wild animal life will be exhausted in the course of time. But so long as the trade is there, it can be taken hold of; and if the trade is suddenly cut off by legislative action, it seems to me there is just claim for compensation on the part of those whose rights are affected. I may be told that there is no legal claim; that the Government can

in this case exercise its right of eminent domain. I admit that, but the sealers never had the pretension to claim from the Government any legal right in the matter. I put it simply on the ground of good conscience: since the Canadian Government has received several hundred thousand dollars, by way of compensation, which are now in the public treasury, is it not right and fair that the men whose business has been destroyed by the action of this Government, whatever its motive may have been, should be compensated? It is not to the honour of Canada that the Government received this money from the American Government and has not compensated the men whose money has been put into the sealing industry. These men built something like seventy schooners, which have remained idle; the money which they put into their business has been absolutely lost. Yet they have received not a single dollar of compensation. Moreover, their schooners are useless for any other purpose than that for which they were designed and built. In view of the fact that the Government has received a large sum of money in consequence of the very impediment which they have put in the way of these men, in fairness and equity the Government should compensate them for the money they put into the business. By action of the Government of Canada—with the purpose of which I am in sympathy—the business of these men was completely destroyed; therefore, out of the money received by the Canadian Government by way of compensation these men should be the first to be compensated.

I have read with care the judgment of Mr. Justice Audette. It seems to me that he takes a narrow view of this matter. He seems to have approached it more or less from the point of view of narrow justice, as it were, rather than from the point of view of, as he says, good conscience and equity. Well, every man may have his own opinion about what is equity, and justice, and good conscience. The application of a definite law dealing with a specific matter is one thing, but in this case no question of law is involved.

It is altogether within the discretion of the men who are now in office to say whether those people shall be compensated or not. If it were a case of taking money out of the treasury for those people, I might say that the Government should not be asked to put their hands into the treasury in order to compensate them, but this is money paid by the American Government for the destruction of those people's industry. There is absolutely no question on that point. Having received the money on that basis, equity and good conscience make it imperative that the money so received should go first to compensate the men whose business has been destroyed. Will this not appeal to the judgment of the gentlemen who are on the treasury benches? Up to the present time, they have refused to depart from the opinion expressed by Mr. Justice Audette. My only objection to his opinion is that he takes too narrow a view. This is a matter which is of no personal concern to any one of us. I do not know who the claimants are. I saw Captain Adams only once in my life. I was, however, in office when this treaty was negotiated. I gave the matter my best consideration, and I thought then that when we received money as compensation, the first men to be paid out of that money ought to be those whose business and livelihood had been destroyed, and whose good money had become worthless. For these considerations, I hope, although my hon. friend will refuse to give an assurance that those men will be more equitably dealt with than in the past or that their claims will be considered, that the Government will reconsider their attitude upon this matter, and see that after all, if we are to treat this matter in equity and good conscience, we should give those men the money.

Mr. D. D. McKENZIE (North Cape Breton): Mr. Speaker, were it not for the fact that a great many people from the county which I have the honour to represent here were interested directly in this industry which is now under discussion, I would not venture to add a word to what has been so ably presented to the House by the leader of the Opposition and the hon. member for Pictou, and replied to by the Minister of Agriculture. As early as the year 1887, several vessels from the Atlantic coast went around Cape Horn and engaged in this business on the British Columbia coast. Ever since then, until the industry was closed out by international regulations and regulations of this Government, the owners of those vessels kept in touch with that industry. Amongst those men were Captain Charles Hackett, Captain J. W. Peppett, Captain Cutler, Captain Ryan, Captain Frank Hackett, Captain Desmond, Captain Bissett and Captain LeBlanc. Some of them were absolute owners of the vessels, and all of

them were interested in the business which they followed. From 1887 down to 1893, and since then down to 1911, at the consummation of the treaty mentioned by several hon. gentlemen here to-day, they conducted a profitable business in the sealing industry with their headquarters in British Columbia. As has already been fully explained, for international reasons and for the purpose of conserving this very valuable industry, and conserving the lives of those seals, it was thought proper to enter into negotiations, and an agreement was made by which that industry was closed out. Those men had a vested interest and a vested right in that industry, just the same as the Minister of Agriculture has a vested right in a certain industry in British Columbia. And I presume that if those who are engaged in the fruit industry of British Columbia were, for some reason, prevented from engaging in that industry, he would ably advocate their rights. I think he would say that if those who have put their money into orchards, or mines, or fisheries in British Columbia were, for some international reason, cut off from their employment, and if moneys were paid into the treasury of Canada as a compensation and consideration for the closing down of those industries, those who were in those businesses and whose occupations were so cut off should be the first to be considered in the division of that money. The interpretation given to that treaty by the leader of the Opposition should receive due consideration. If a certain document is in writing or if a certain statute goes through Parliament, the man who wrote the document or who drafted the Act or had a hand in putting it through Parliament, has perhaps no more to say as to the proper interpretation of it than anybody else, because a judicial interpretation must be given as to the meaning the words in it must bear. But when international negotiations are conducted, as the negotiations in regard to this treaty were conducted, and when all the motives and ideas are not put into writing, the views of the then Prime Minister of the country, who was one of the parties to those negotiations, and who knew what the negotiations were, should be considered when the matter is discussed. We are told by the right hon. gentleman who leads the Opposition, but who was the Prime Minister of this country at the time this treaty was negotiated and received the approval of His Majesty and passed into an international bargain, that the intention was that, so far as that agreement curtailed the profits of any people engaged in the sealing industry, they should be compensated as far as the money received would go. That is the interpretation given to the treaty by the man who negotiated it. That being the case, that being the idea conveyed to those people by the Government of the day and by the Prime Minister who negotiated the agreement, it is incumbent upon those who succeeded him in office to carry out that policy. The Government may say: If we had been in power at the time, we would not have made such an agreement; we would not have stopped the industry, we would not have interfered with the people who were working in it, and if we had interfered with them at all, we would not have paid them any compensation. But the King and the power of the King were represented at that time by the Prime Minister of that day, and he made a certain arrangement. It is, therefore, incumbent upon the Government of the day to carry it out. This principle has been recognized in this country before. Hon. gentlemen in this House, and particularly hon. members of the Government, remember the treaty of Washington, in connection with which there was what is well known as the Fisheries Award. There was paid into the treasury of Canada on account of the award the sum of $5,000,000. The Government of the day did not think that was money that they could apply in the ordinary way; they considered it was something that belonged practically to the fishing industry of this country. What happened—and what is the law to-day—was that at least a certain amount of that money was placed at interest, and the interest of it is paid as a bounty to the fishermen of Canada. Everyone knows that the fishermen of Canada on both coasts receive a bounty. That money comes to them out of this Washington treaty fisheries award. Because the treaty of Washington permitted a condition of things that meant interference to some extent with the fishery business, the money that came to the Government by reason of the concession given to American fishermen was divided amongst the fishermen of Canada, and is being divided in that way to-day. The taking of this money which we get for the sealing industry and establishing some equitable basis upon which it will be divided amongst those people whose interests are affected by reason of the treaty, would be only carrying out, and perhaps extending to a certain degree, the principles that were estab-

lished by the Government of the day in connection with the award paid to this country under the treaty of Washington.

I submit, therefore, that it would not be doing anything new if the Government took this money and made such an equitable division of it between the corporations and the men who were engaged in this business on the basis of the facts as they were ascertained.

As I understand the findings of Mr. Justice Audette, they do not go the full length of the principle involved in this question. I understand his position to be that no person has any claim on the Government for any part of this money, and that no person could at law establish a claim against the Crown for it. I need not tell you, Sir, or any member of the Government that you cannot establish a claim against the Crown except by statute; that is, unless there is an Act of Parliament fixing that obligation upon the Crown. Mr. Justice Audette could have made a finding of that sort at the start. The moment he discovered there was no such statute he could have said that it was useless to go any further. But that was not the idea of starting the investigation, and perhaps I am doing him an injustice in saying that that was his conclusion, but, nevertheless, as I understand it, that was his conclusion.

The Government, as representing the Crown, are mere trustees of this money. They receive the money in trust for a certain specific purpose, and it is their duty to divide it properly and equitably upon the basis of the facts as they appear. In the colony of Newfoundland and in the provinces of New Brunswick, Prince Edward Island, and Nova Scotia, and particularly that part of Nova Scotia to which I belong, there were hundreds of people engaged in this industry. Many vessels were bought on the Atlantic coast, taken around the Horn and engaged in the sealing business on the other side. But all these people were put out of business by the treaty. I submit that when there is in the hands of the Government money that was paid to them under a treaty that put an end to this industry, the people who were engaged in it have a claim in equity, and justice, and good conscience against the Government. I submit that if it is found that Mr. Justice Audette's decision is not wide enough, or that he has not gone sufficiently deep into this question, further investigation should be made, and a further opportunity to be heard should be given to the people whose interests are affected. If the Government should find that they are mere trustees for this money, and that it was to be given to the people who were engaged in this industry, I trust they will not permit any mere technicalities to stand in the way, but will deal with the matter broadly and properly as the justice of the case demands.

Hon. C. J. DOHERTY (Minister of Justice): It appears to be common ground that there is no question involved here of a legal right on the part of those whose cause has been pleaded here this afternoon. The question is one entirely of what ought to be done in equity and good conscience, and the question was so submitted to Mr. Justice Audettte, and so dealt with by him. The contention of hon. gentlemen who have spoken in support of some further recognition of this claim seems to me to rest, if I may say so with all respect, upon a misapprehension of what it was that this money was paid for. Their reasoning would lead one to believe that they look upon it as money paid for damage suffered in the past. Now a glance at the treaty of 1911 will show that what was paid for was the foregoing by Canada, on behalf of her citizens, of the right to carry on pelagic sealing for a period of time in the future. The loss, therefore, that was being compensated for was a loss that might occur to people in the future.

9 p.m.

Mr. MACDONALD: Here was the Victoria Sealing Company with its vessels all prepared, but they were unable to carry on their business by reason of these regulations. The minister must not forget that the basis of our contention in the negotiations with the American Government was the fact that in the past there were deprivations of that character.

Mr. DOHERTY: I was coming to the position, as I understand it, of the Victoria Sealing Company, but I think it is well to get clear at the outset what this money was paid to us for—because until we know what it was paid to us for, it is impossible for us to ascertain who has any particular or specific claim upon that money as distinct from the claim of the whole public of Canada, for whom the Government received and holds this money. What was paid for, was the foregoing for fifteen years, then in the future, of the privilege on the part of Canada, as representing all Canadians, of exercising the right of pelagic sealing. Now that right of pelagic sealing that we agreed to forego for that period of time in the

future was the right to pelagic sealing as that right could legally be exercised at the time the treaty was entered into; that is to say, the right to pelagic sealing subject to the regulations of the Treaty of Paris. That right had been so limited and so restricted by the regulations of the Treaty of Paris that this Victoria Sealing Company in particular had, as I understand the facts, abandoned the business.

Mr. MACDONALD: No, the Victoria Sealing Company never abandoned the business.

Mr. DOHERTY: Ceased to carry on the business.

Mr. MACDONALD: By reason of the fact that the regulations of the Treaty of Paris prevented them from doing so.

Mr. DOHERTY: That is precisely what I am pointing out. The regulations of the Treaty of Paris made it not worth while for the Victoria Sealing Company to carry on the business, and that was the condition when the treaty was entered into whereby Canada, on behalf of her people, renounced the right of carrying on the business under the treaty which is now in question, and received compensation for her renunciation of the right to carry on the business under those conditions. That right to carry on the business was open to every Canadian citizen just as fully as it was to the Victoria Sealing Company, and the compensation was to Canada as a whole for foregoing something in the future.

Mr. MACDONALD: Not necessarily, it was not so stated.

Mr. DOHERTY: That is the treaty. What did we do? We agreed to forego the right to pelagic sealing for fifteen years to come, and for that we were to be paid this proportion of the catch that was to be got in those fifteen years to come.

Mr. MACDONALD: Not in the fifteen years to come, because there was no right to make it.

Mr. DOHERTY: We agreed to forego the right. Our people had the right to carry on the pelagic sealing, subject to the regulations of the Treaty of Paris.

Mr. MACDONALD: No, my hon. friend is not correct in that, because, if he will permit me, the conclusions of the Treaty of Paris say that we could carry that on in the open sea, but it was of no value, seeing that we could not reach the rookery.

[Mr. Doherty.]

Mr. DOHERTY: This is all a question of pelagic sealing. If that was of no value at all, it cannot have been of any value to the Victoria Sealing Company any more than to anybody else. Whatever its value was, much or little, that is what we had in 1911, and that was the only thing we could forego, because we could not forego what we had not. The United States Government undertook to pay this compensation to this country, as the representative of all its inhabitants, for our renunciation of the exercise of that right, whatever may have been its value, for a period of time to come. That right, as it stood at that time, the thing that we agreed to forego, was a right which in the judgment of the Victoria Sealing Company was not worth while for it to exercise, and it had ceased to exercise that right. The Victoria Sealing Company therefore stood in the same position as any other citizen of Canada who did not find that under the conditions it was worth while to carry on that business. When we come to deal with consideration of individuals, we have to remember that the money we have is not the price of anything that happened in the past. It is the price of our foregoing a right for the future, and whoever would be affected fairly and equitably in the future by that remuneration of ours, ought to get compensation, and fairly enough those who were actually exercising this right at the time we agreed to forego it, have been considered and have been compensated. The refusal is as regards the people who, three or four years before, made up their minds it was not worth their while to exercise the right—

Mr. MACDONALD: No.

Mr. DOHERTY: —demonstrating therefore that they would not be among the class of people affected by the fact that we renounced that right for the next fifteen years.

Mr. MACDONALD: In the argument my hon. friend is making, he is excluding altogether the fact that this company kept its ships tied up by the wharf on account of the understanding with the Government.

Mr. DOHERTY: With all respect, I think my hon. friend is quite mistaken when he says that those people who sent their ships out did so in violation of the regulations of the Treaty of Paris. I think the best demonstration of the fact that they did not violate the treaty is that they were able to carry on operations with impunity, and were never seized. They went out in the

exercise of the rights of pelagic sealing, subject to the regulations of the Treaty of Paris, and they thought it worth their while. They are, therefore, among the class of people who, presumably at all events, would have gone on if this last treaty had not been passed, and they are the people who in a particular manner, different from all other citizens of Canada, are affected by our renunciation of that right. They are fairly and equitably the people who ought to be compensated, and they are the people who were compensated. But to carry the argument made on behalf of the Victoria Sealing Company to its logical conclusion, if that company is entitled to remuneration on the grounds stated, then it seems to me that anybody who at any time had carried on the business of pelagic sealing, ought to get compensation, because that ground is that though they had ceased to carry on the business, and though it clearly appeared that they were not going to carry it on in any way during the fifteen years covered by the treaty they had at some past time carried on the business of pelagic sealing. That was the matter that was submitted to Mr. Justice Audette. I think that there can be no claim upon those moneys on the part of those people as being deprived of something they otherwise would have had in the future is most clearly established by the fact that when it is sought to support their claim—and I refer particularly to the very interesting and very forcible speech of the right hon. leader of the Opposition (Sir Wilfrid Laurier)—it all has to be made to rest upon the damage it is claimed they sustained by reason of the regulations under the Treaty of Paris. Well, those regulations were passed and were in force for a number of years before this treaty, and those regulations were made by competent authority to control the carrying on of that business, and the loss that resulted to the Victoria Sealing Company or anybody else from the enactment of those regulations—

Mr. MACDONALD: There was nobody else so far as Canada was concerned.

Mr. DOHERTY: My hon. friend from North Sydney (Mr. McKenzie) has just been telling us of a large number of people in his part of the country who were engaged in pelagic sealing.

Mr. MACDONALD: They were in the Victoria Sealing Company.

Mr. DOHERTY: Very well—the Victoria Sealing Company, including everybody else. What I was endeavouring to say when I was interrupted was, that the case had to be sustained as a case of damage to these people by pointing out the damage suffered following the regulations of the Treaty of Paris. With regard to those regulations and the damage which resulted from them, those people who were carrying on the industry were in precisely the same position as any fisherman is towards fishery regulations which may be made in this country, and I do not think it would be suggested that if this country, in the exercise of control of its own fisheries, makes regulations for the preservation of the fishery industry, that those who, in the long run, are going to be benefited by those regulations, by the conservation of their industry, would be entitled to claim damages because they are prevented from making a wholesale slaughter of the fish. That was the situation of the people engaged in the sealing industry as towards the regulations of the Treaty of Paris. They were engaged in this trade, and the permanence of the trade depended upon proper regulation being made. Proper authority made the regulations, which were in the interest of everybody engaged in the industry actually or to be so engaged in the future, and I confess I have difficulty in seeing how a claim for damage resulting from the enforcement of those regulations could very well be enforced—I am not speaking legally, but should be recognized as a matter of fairness and justice. But, whether it should or should not be, surely it cannot be pretended that these people should be made better off because subsequently the entire pelagic sealing industry was suppressed; and if they are to share in this money which is the price of that suppression for the future, they will be better off than if this treaty never had been passed. If they should be so compensated, then these people would actually be better off by reason of the renunciation made by this treaty because they would get compensation for past damages arising from another cause, and not at all from the passing of this treaty, which they never would have been entitled to if pelagic sealing, subject to the regulations, had remained open to everybody.

The hon. member for North Cape Breton (Mr. McKenzie) refers as a precedent to what was done with the moneys awarded under the Washington treaty, and says that certains portions of those moneys were invested to provide for money for those engaged, after its passing up to the present time, in the fishing industry. The case is absolutely different. There the money is

being utilized to compensate people who, in the conditions created by the treaty, existing subsequently to the treaty, are carrying on their business at a disadvantage. They are people particularly affected by the result of the treaty in a different way from every other individual Canadian. But here we are asked to apply that money not to indemnify anybody affected by the consequent effects of the treaty but somebody that suffered a damage by reason of something that was done years before.

Mr. McKENZIE: Is that not merely a question of degree? In the fishery case they were at a disadvantage but were permitted to go on; but in the other case they were stopped altogether.

Mr. DOHERTY: Being permitted to go on they are a class of people directly and particularly affected by the continued operation of that treaty, and therefore, if we get compensation for foregoing on behalf of the people of Canada the right under that treaty to carry on certain fishing operations, I can see the fairness and equity of applying some of that money to compensate people who, by reason of that treaty, are hampered in the industry they carry on. I am not contending that people who were carrying on the industry at the time of this last treaty and were cut off from doing it should not have compensation to the extent of the damage they proved, and they have had it. I was just pointing out that the case we now are dealing with differs in every respect from the case of the fishermen to whom my hon. friend from North Sydney refers. I quite appreciate the sympathy of hon. gentlemen with these gentlemen who are interested in the sealing industry, but I must confess that, eliminating the question of legal obligation, trying to judge it as a question of what is fair and reasonable, I do not see that the Government of Canada, which has received this money in trust, just as all the moneys of Canada are in its hands in trust for all the people of Canada,—

Mr. MACDONALD: Oh no, this is a special trust.

Mr. DOHERTY: That is precisely where I join issue. It is in trust for all the people who, during those fifteen years are deprived of this privilege, and I am prepared to concede that in equity and fairness, if there is any individual Canadian who shows that by Canada's renunciation of that right for that fifteen years he suffers a damage or an injury distinct and different from that which is suffered by the whole public, he ought to get compensation.

Mr. MACDONALD: What better case could my hon. friend have in considering the matter of damage than that of a company which has tied up at the wharf six schooners especially built for the sealing industry and which is unable to use those schooners under the Paris regulations, and has not used them for fifteen years?

Mr. DOHERTY: They were unable, under the Paris regulations, to use them and that was their settled and defined position; and this treaty did not make them any more unable to use them, it left them precisely where they were in that regard. We are asked to compensate a man for being prevented under this treaty from carrying on a business that, in the conditions that existed before this treaty, he was unable to carry on.

What I have sought to make clear is that the damage to these people, in so far as they were damaged, resulted from what had taken place years before this treaty, and that this treaty left them neither better nor worse off; and this money was paid to us for the foregoing of a right, subsequent to the execution of the treaty that these people, by their own admission, were not in a position, by reason of anterior events, to exercise or avail themselves of.

Mr. MACDONALD: How could it be possible by the law of Canada settled under this international agreement, for anybody to set up a claim during the fifteen years for the right to legally go out and seal in Behring sea and assert that they had vessels or schooners or anything of that kind, when it was well understood, it was known as a matter of public law, that it was impossible for anybody to go sealing?

Mr. DOHERTY: They were all subject to the regulations. The right that they had was to go out and fish subject to the regulations. On their behalf and on behalf of all the people of Canada, Canada renounced that right, and anybody deprived of the right which he was exercising to fish under the regulations was entitled to compensation. All of those who went so far towards showing that as to show that they were carrying on the business under the regulations, got compensation.

Mr. MACDONALD: Where is the rest of it going?

Mr. DOHERTY: The rest of it belongs to Canada in the right of the whole of the

people of Canada. None of us can go pelagic sealing.

Mr. McKENZIE: If the regulations under the treaty of Paris put an end to pelagic sealing, what had we to give up by this treaty of 1911?

Mr. DOHERTY: It did not put an end to pelagic sealing, it regulated and restricted pelagic sealing. If they had put an end to pelagic sealing then we would have had nothing to give up, just as the hon. gentleman says: It is not quite conceivable that if we had had nothing to give up, our American friends would have undertaken to pay us something approximating $7,000,000 for that nothing. We had something to give up, and there were people carrying on pelagic sealing subject to the restrictions and regulations, and that is the right we had.

Mr. MACDONALD: Only four. What does the minister say to the consideration of this matter given by Mr. Found in this report to the Naval Department?

Mr. DOHERTY: I have heard the reading of that report, and it would seem to indicate that Mr. Found was under the impression that something ought to be paid to these gentlemen. I have difficulty in accepting that conclusion, although I have not carefully read the report. I have read with considerable care the report of Mr. Justice Audette, and I may add that before the matter was submitted to the commission I had occasion to go with some degree of care into the consideration of this question, and for what value that may have, I may say that the conclusion of Mr. Audette was by no means a surprise to me. The impression I had formed was that that was the only conclusion that could properly and fairly be reached.

Mr. MACDONALD: Does the hon. gentleman think that, from the standpoint of equity, justice and fair play, a company with whom the Canadian Government was negotiating right along, with whom the Government had conferences immediately preceding the treaty of 1911 as to the question of compensation, a company who had vessels prepared to go sailing, which were tied up to the wharf at Victoria, would have no bona fide reasonable claim for consideration upon the Government of the day, and for some allowance out of this fund which is paid to those who are to be prevented from sealing, realizing that nobody else would, in all human probability, prepare facilities for the purpose of engaging in sealing during the next fifteen years, that are to come during part of which time sealing is prohibited?

Mr. DOHERTY: We look at the matter from different angles. I do not think it would be equity, justice and fair play to the people of Canada in general if we took their money and gave it to some one for whom we were sorry because some years before—

Mr. MACDONALD: What interest has the man in the interior in sealing?

Mr. DOHERTY: None special to himself. But here is $7,000,000 belonging to Canada, which the man in Ontario has a share in, just the same as the man in British Columbia, and the only reason put forward so far I can see for paying the money to these particular individuals is that, unfortunately for them, they invested money in an enterprise which, by regulation of competent authority, was made unprofitable. That seems to me to be the situation, and we are asked to take the money of the people of Canada and pay to these people for foregoing the right to carry on pelagic sealing under unprofitable conditions not by reason of this treaty, but of the position created by previous regulations. We are asked to take the money of the whole of the people of Canada and pay it to these gentlemen because we are sorry for them.

Mr. MACDONALD: The whole question is a relative one. You can well understand that a man in British Columbia would not engage in sealing in Nova Scotia, or a man who was interested in the cultivation of soil in the prairies, who knew nothing about seas, would not engage in sealing in other parts of the Dominion. But if you have a case where the people have the vessels which are actually engaged in the enterprise tied up to the wharf, prepared to go out, but prevented from going out by reason of regulations made by this Government with a foreign government, does the hon. gentleman mean to say that the owners of the vessels in close proximity to the place where the sealing can be carried on have no equity by which they would be given the first right to participate in the fund? The Government having agreed to a fifteen-year prevention of sealing, nobody else in Canada would ever engage in it in that period.

Mr. DOHERTY: I have tried to say what I mean to say.

Mr. MACDONALD: I know what the hon. gentleman has to say, but he has not met my point exactly.

EXPORT OF POTATOES.

Mr. CARVELL: I wish to call attention of the House very shortly to a matter of which I gave notice to the Prime Minister (Sir Robert Borden) and to the Minister of Agriculture (Mr. Burrell) yesterday, regarding the duty on potatoes. Some two or three weeks ago I asked the Government if it was their intention to make potatoes free under the provision of the United States Tariff Bill and under the War Measures Act. I was promised consideration, and as nothing was said about it, on Thursday last I asked the Government the question. That question and the statement respecting it made on behalf of the Government are as follows:

Mr. F. B. Carvell (Carleton, N.B.): A week or so ago I asked the Government if they would not consider the advisability of removing the duty on potatoes, the effect of which would be that our potatoes would have the right to enter the United States free of duty. I was promised consideration of the matter and I would now ask the minister if he is able to give an answer.

Sir Thomas White: The matter referred to by my hon. friend (Mr. Carvell) is one relating to the tariff. Announcements of that kind are not discussed in advance for reasons which will be obvious to the House. I am unable to make any statement with respect to the matter except to say that any action the Government may take will be announced in due course. It is impossible for me to make a statement in reference to the matter at the present time.

While the Minister of Finance (Sir Thomas White) is usually very courteous, I thought he was rather testy about the matter, and I was rather surprised at the attitude he assumed. Therefore, I thought it in the interest of my constituents that I should give this matter some little publicity before prorogation. I do not intend to move an amendment, because I realize that such a motion on going to Supply would be treated as a vote of want of confidence, and this is a matter of such great importance to my constituents that I am not going to offer an amendment and have it voted down. On the other hand, I want to present the case to the Government, and see if they will not act and do justice to the great body of people in the Maritime Provinces especially, and people all over central Canada as a whole. I do not know that it is necessary to state that the cultivation of the potato is by far the greatest agricultural industry in the Maritime Provinces. In the last two years the value of this crop in the Maritime Provinces has far exceeded any other agricultural product, and I think I should be safe in saying, all other agricultural products put together, though possibly this last statement may be a little extreme. In my own constituency last year according to the best of figures I could obtain, they received something like seven or eight million dollars for the potatoes which they disposed of. In that item I include the counties of Victoria and Carleton, because that is the constituency, a part of which at least I now represent. These two counties are by far the greatest potato-producting counties in Canada. But all the other counties along the St. John river, and to a very great extent on what we call the North Shore, and around the county of Westmorland, are great potato producing counties. In addition, there is the province of Prince Edward Island, where, if they had proper transportation facilities, the crop would far exceed that of any other portion of Canada, and I believe, of the North American continent. The House will see, from my cursory statement, that the potato industry in the Maritime Provinces is an important one, and any legislation affecting the production or price of potatoes is a matter of prime importance to the people of that portion of Canada. To give you some idea of the importance of this industry, I shall read to the House a statement which I received to-day from the Commissioner of Customs:

STATEMENT SHOWING THE IMPORTS AND EXPORTS OF POTATOES, BY COUNTRIES, DURING THE FISCAL YEAR ENDED 31 MARCH, 1917, AND ALSO DURING THE FIVE MONTHS ENDED 31 AUGUST, 1917.

Imports entered for consumption.	Fiscal year ended 31 March, 1917.		Five months ended 31 August, 1917.	
	Bush.	Value.	Bush.	Value.
Great Britain	28	$ 73	..	$ ..
Bermuda	..	..	5	9
British West Indies	2	2	5	4
Hong Kong	36	36	10	17
China	2	2	..	..
Japan	343	269	..	..
United States	567,759	546,476	431,119	765,538
Totals	568,170	$546,858	431,139	$765,568

STATEMENT SHOWING THE IMPORTS AND EXPORTS OF POTATOES, ETC.—*Concluded.*

Exports, produce of Canada.	Fiscal year ended 31 March, 1917. Bush.	Value.	Five months ended 31 August, 1917. Bush.	Value.
Great Britain	2	$ 2	808	$ 2,017
Bermuda	43,606	48,737	4,365	7,952
British Guiana	66,838	77,222	7,940	16,486
British West Indies	51,338	58,943	6,636	13,709
Fiji Islands	1,921	1,442	33	60
Newfoundland	56,426	40,985	596	996
Alaska	153	220	2,202	5,146
Cuba	997,581	1,226,774	166,019	325,111
China	208	156	.....	.....
Greenland and Iceland	.....	.....	45	113
Hawaii	118	144	.....	.....
Miquelon and St. Pierre	9,352	6,825	549	1,189
Porto Rico	40	59	.....	.....
United States	1,645,155	1,837,583	1,136,366	1,941,638
Totals	2,872,738	$3,299,092	1,325,559	$2,314,417

I have computed the duty upon potatoes imported during the periods mentioned. The duty on the potatoes imported in the fiscal year ended March 31, 1917, would amount to $109,371, and, during the five months ended August 31, 1917, $86,227, a total of about $200,000.

You will see that during the last fiscal year out of 568,170 bushels of potatoes imported, 567,759 bushels came from the United States. Practically the whole of our import, therefore, is from the United States. During the first five months of this year, out of a total of 431,139 bushels imported, 431,119 bushels came from the United States. That is to say, with the exception of 20 bushels, all the potatoes imported into Canada during this fiscal year came from the United States. When you come to the exports, the proportion is nearly the same, except in the case of Cuba. We exported to Cuba last year practically a million bushels of potatoes, of a value of $1,225,000, and during the first five months of this year we exported 166,000 bushels valued at$325,000. To the United States we exported 1,645,155 bushels valued at $1,837,583 during the last fiscal year, and during the first five months of the present fiscal year 1,136,366 bushels valued at $1,941,638. A considerable proportion of the exports that I have mentioned would be of the crop of 1915, but a very large proportion would be out of the crop of 1916. We are safe in saying, therefore, that considerably over 2,000,000 bushels of potatoes were exported from Canada to the United States last year—it would probably come nearer 2,500,000 bushels.

Mr. EDWARDS: Can my hon. friend say how much of that was from eastern and how much was from western Canada?

Mr. CARVELL: No, I have not the figures. I telephoned the Commissioner of Customs to-day and I am giving the statement as I have it. I am satisfied, however, that practically the whole of that export would be from the eastern portion of Quebec, and the Maritime Provinces.

Mr. BURRELL: Quite a lot from the West.

Mr. CARVELL: There may be some from British Columbia.

Mr. BURRELL: And Alberta.

Mr. CARVELL: There would be nothing from Ontario last year.

Mr. EDWARDS: There was a shortage in Ontario and a surplus, I understand, in the Prairie Provinces.

Mr. CARVELL: I have tried to get the data, but have failed; I am giving the House the information that I have. A very large percentage of this business must have come from the Maritime Provinces and eastern Quebec. No portion of Canada has made such tremendous strides in the production of potatoes as the province of Quebec from Lévis eastward, and, to some extent, westward. It is wonderful what the people of Quebec are doing, especially on the southern bank of the St. Lawrence river from Lévis all the way to the Gaspé peninsula.

We know that practically all the potatoes that are imported into Canada come in the early summer, before our potatoes are available. So that the duty of $200,000 that we pay on potatoes imported into Canada is paid at a time when we are compelled to import new potatoes because none of our own are available.

When you consider that those are the prices of the exporting country, and add to

that the cost of transportation and the cost of two or three profits, you will find that, by the time you get the potatoes to the consumer, instead of the cost of those potatoes being increased by $200,000, the increase as a result of that duty will be nearer $400,000. Those early potatoes are consumed very largely by people who are able to buy and pay for them, so that the increased price of them does not impose a hardship upon the ordinary labouring man that would be imposed by increased prices of many other articles through increased duties. It, however, greatly increases the cost of living in Canada under present conditions.

I wish to direct the attention of the House particularly to the question of the export of potatoes. In New Brunswick our farmers are raising, not a few hundred bushels but thousands of barrels. Many farmers in my constituency last year raised from 1,000 to 3,000 and 4,000 barrels each —we reckon our potatoes altogether by barrels instead of by bushels. Therefore, when you add a small amount of ten cents, or fifteen cents, or twenty cents a bushel, you have made a wonderful change in the income of the farmer. The duty on potatoes going into the United States is ten per cent ad valorem. If potatoes are worth $2 per barrel, as they are in New Brunswick today, and we send them over to the United States, if everything went properly, we would pay twenty cents a barrel for the purpose of getting those potatoes into the United States; or in other words, the farmer would get twenty cents a barrel more than he can possibly receive under present conditions. That is the way in which it works out. I am not going to argue now whether the importer or the exporter pays the duty, because that very largely depends upon the special conditions existing regarding each particular transaction, but so far as we in the Maritime Provinces are concerned, there is not any question about the matter—the Canadian farmer pays the duty. I live within ten miles of the boundary line and our farmers live up and down along that line, and potatoes are being raised on both sides of it. In Aroostook you will find that potatoes are worth the value of potatoes on our side of the line plus the duty. There is no use in making any argument about the matter; those are the facts. A man can argue as much as he chooses, but those who go into the Maritime Provinces and get to know what they are speaking about would not listen to him.

[Mr. Carvell.]

Mr. MORPHY: What is your market, and how are your potatoes transported?

Mr. CARVELL: Our potatoes in New Brunswick go practically altogether to New England points, and they go almost wholly by rail. Potatoes from Nova Scotia and Prince Edward Island are carried by water to a great extent. In Nova Scotia, a limited trade has been carried on for many years, but that with the West Indian islands trade is only a bagatelle as compared with the trade with the United States. We have, however, a big trade with Cuba, and that goes partly by water and partly by rail. I am satisfied, if you investigate the details of the returns, you will find that a great proportion of the potatoes sent to Cuba last year, which came from my constituency and along the river St. John, were shipped by rail to Boston and from Boston to Cuba by water. That is the ordinary route of travel. I have one client and constituent who last year, to my knowledge, sold considerably over $100,000 worth of potatoes to Cuba alone and they all went by rail to Boston and thence by steamer. I have another client and constituent who must have handled $50,000 worth of potatoes in the same market, and from my knowledge, I believe a large proportion of those potatoes came from New Brunswick. I find that during the fiscal year ended March 31, 1917, and the first five months of this year, we have sent to the United States about $3,800,000 worth of potatoes upon which we have paid a duty of 10 per cent, or $380,000. We have simply contributed that amount of money to the revenues of the United States. In addition to that, we have sent to Cuba over $1,500,000 worth of potatoes, practically all of which went through American ports. If the duty were removed from potatoes going into the United States, we would save the duty on that portion as well, because the United States have a preferential treaty with Cuba—that is, potatoes from the United States can be sent into Cuba at a lower rate of duty than potatoes coming from any other part of the continent. If potatoes were made free into the United States, of course our potatoes would all go to the United States and none of them direct to Cuba, they would be exported to the United States and then when they were properly in that country they could be sold to Cuba or wherever the buyers chose to send them. The result would be that all the potatoes going to Cuba, as well as to the United States, would go free of duty, and that

would mean, on the figures I have given, about $500,000 of extra money in the pockets of the people of New Brunswick.

Mr. MORPHY: What advantage does the hon. gentleman find in shipping potatoes to Boston? Is there an increased price to any extent, and what is it?

Mr. CARVELL: There is an increased price and an increased market. Last year potatoes reached an exorbitant, outrageous price.

Mr. MORPHY: But in an average year?

Mr. CARVELL: I do not take last year as a guide, because when farmers are getting $6 or $7 a barrel for potatoes they have no cause to complain of tariff regulations or regulations of any other kind. I am dismissing that from my argument, and I am trying to discuss the matter under ordinary conditions.

Mr. WRIGHT: What is the difference in quantity and value between the potatoes exported from Canada to the United States and the potatoes imported from the United States into Canada?

Mr. CARVELL: It is very great. Take the year ended March, 1917, and the first five months of this year. During that period we imported from the United States 1,000,000 bushels, and we exported to the United States about 2,800,000 bushels. You would have to add to that, if you want to get a real understanding of what the difference would be in case the duty were removed, the quantity of potatoes which we sent to Cuba and which would amount to 1,150,000 bushels. I am speaking in round figures. Therefore, the quantity of our export to the United States would be easily four times the quantity of our imports.

Mr. WRIGHT: That would be for last year, not for an average year.

Mr. CARVELL: I am taking last year and the first five months of this year. Prior to 1916 very few of these were sent to the United States, because after the passing of the Underwood tariff, under which potatoes were practically free—there was only a ten per cent ad valorem duty—certain very shrewd Yankees who live about forty or fifty miles from my home conceived the idea of throwing mud at the Canadian potatoes by claiming that they were afflicted with a disease known as powdery scab. It was all a myth; there never was any powdery scab, but just the ordinary scab that we have seen on potatoes ever since we were children. But these gentlemen scared their Government and our Government and everybody else, and I think I am safe in saying that it cost this Government almost $100,000 to fight the disease. Regulations and a rigid inspection were put in force and it was almost imposible for us to ship our potatoes across the line. But last year, when the United States wanted our potatoes, they did not bother very much about powdery scab or about regulations and inspection. They wanted our potatoes and were glad to get them. So last year would be the first in a great many years when trade flowed freely without any unnatural barriers. I admit that the valuation is very, very far in excess of what the same volume of business would amount to in an ordinary year.

Coming back to the question put by the Minister of Agriculture, I stated that according to the reports furnished by the department practically a million bushels of potatoes were imported in the two years I have been discussing. We exported in the same period to the United States about 2,800,000 bushels, and to Cuba 1,500,000 bushels. Altogether we exported practically 4,000,000 bushels. So far as I know, the regulations regarding powdery scab and inspection and all that sort of thing are not being adhered to at the present time, and trade flows as freely as it naturally can, except for the duty. The United States customs authorities fix an arbitrary figure in arriving at the valuation. As I understand it, they do not take the invoice price of each carload of potatoes, but place an arbitrary figure upon potatoes from a certain area. At the present time that arbitrary figure for the Maritime Provinces is $3 a barrel, Actually our farmers are only getting $2 a barrel. The result is that under their method of assessing the duty is increased by fifty per cent. With that exception, trade is flowing as it naturally would under ordinary conditions.

Mr. MORPHY: What justification is there for them doing that?

Mr. CARVELL: I am not complaining. It is a regulation of the United States Government, and I suppose they have their own reasons for it. I do not mean for a moment to say that they are doing it to be unneighbourly, or anything of that kind.

Mr. MORPHY: What does our Government do in return?

Mr. CARVELL: I do not know. I only happen to know this because a few days ago

I received a letter from an organization in New Brunswick, known as the New Brunswick Potato Exchange, who are really the greatest potato dealers in Canada, pointing this out to me, and wanting to know if something could not be done to remedy it. The result of this method of determining the duty by the United States is that we pay a great deal more than we really should.

10 p.m.

I would not attempt to say what the surplus in the United States will be this year, but I know it will be very large. As regards Canada, I have been told by gentlemen interested in the business that, without taking the Maritime Provinces at all, the surplus in Canada will be six or seven million bushels. If that be true, it is perfectly safe to say that we shall have a surplus in Canada of at least 10,000,000 bushels, because in the maritime province alone I think we shall have a surplus of about 5,000,000 or 6,000,000 bushels. So if I am right in the information I have received—and if I am not the minister can correct me—the surplus this year will be easily 10,000,000 bushels. In other years, when there has been a shortage of potatoes in Quebec and Ontario, we have been able to ship out potatoes there, but when there is no shortage in Quebec and Ontario, we have no market for our potatoes except the United States. Let me give the House an illustration of what that means. In the spring of 1915, there were, I think I am safe in saying, from half a million to a million bushels of potatoes sold in New Brunswick at 15 cents a bushel, and tens of thousands of bushels were thrown on the dump because there was not stock enough to eat them up. The reason for this condition was that there was no demand for potatoes in Quebec and Ontario, and we were debarred by the regulations from sending our potatoes to the United States. The House can readily see the importance of having the United States market open to us. If the provinces of Quebec and Ontario want potatoes, we have them for them, but if they do not want them, unless we can sell to the United States or Cuba, we have absolutely no market and are in exactly the same position we were in in the spring of 1915.

Mr. MORPHY: Do the farmers of New Brunswick make potatoes their sole production?

M. CARVELL: I am sorry to say that they do, to a greater extent than they ought to. I know for a fact that one of my constituents made $20,000—and this was clear profit—from forty acres of land.

Mr. HANNA: That was an exception.

Mr. CARVELL: I admit that if the price of potatoes was always the same as last year's price, I would not be arguing for a remission of duty or anything else, but would be asking the Food Controller to get busy as quickly as he could. But this year, as I said before, there is an enormous surplus in Ontario and in the West and in the East, and unless we have access to the United States market we cannot sell our product. Fortunately, we have access now, but we are compelled to pay ten per cent duty. As I pointed out it really means 15 per cent because of the way the value is assessed. If hon. gentlemen will look at the United States tariff of 1913 they will find the free list starting at item 387. Item 581, page 54, deals with potatoes, and is as follows:

581. Potatoes, and potatoes dried, desiccated, or otherwise prepared, not specially provided for in this section: provided that any of the foregoing specified articles shall be subject to a duty of ten per centum ad valorem when imported directly or indirectly from a country, dependency, or rather subdivision of government which imposes a duty on such articles imported from the United States.

In other words, potatoes are free unless they come from a country which imposes a duty upon potatoes coming from the United States, in which case the duty is ten per cent ad valorem. The section of the United States tariff dealing with wheat, item 644, is as follows:

644. Wheat, wheat flour, semolina, and other wheat products, not specially provided for in this section: provided that wheat shall be subject to a duty of 10 cents per bushel, that wheat flour shall be subject to a duty of 45 cents per barrel of 196 pounds, and semolina and other products of wheat, not specially provided for in this section, ten per centum ad valorem when imported directly or indirectly from a country, dependency, or other subdivision of government which imposes a duty on wheat or wheat flour or semolina imported from the United States.

It will be seen, therefore, that the latter part of these two clauses are identical. The law was made exactly the same regarding wheat, wheat products, semolina, and potatoes. Under the War Measures Act, as hon. members are well aware, during the recess of the present session of Parliament, and only three or four days before Parliament re-assembled, the Government passed an Order in Council placing wheat, wheat flour, and semolina on the free list. I shall not go into that question again, because

it has already been discussed in the House. At the same time I think I have a right to argue, and I am sure no hon. gentleman will disagree with me, that having the right to do this with wheat and wheat products, they have the same right with regard to potatoes. Therefore, it comes down to a question of policy. The law is there and the machinery is there. All it needs is a simple Order in Council which may be passed in ten minutes at any time, and potatoes can be made free.

If they are made free coming into Canada, we can send our surplus product into the United States free of duty. As I pointed out during the last year and a half this has meant a tax paid by the people of my province, and very largely of my constituency, amounting to about half a million dollars. This year we shall be in a much worse shape than we were last year, because we must sell our potatoes to the United States and Cuba, as there is no other market for us. What I want the Government to do, and what in my judgment they should do, as a matter of fair-handed justice is: treat us the same as they treated the West, pass an Order in Council removing the duty on potatoes coming into Canada, and automatically you will remove the duty on potatoes going into the United States from Canada. Then, if another year the Government, whoever they may be, feel that conditions have changed and that it is not in the best interests of the country to retain potatoes on the free list, all they have to do is to repeal the Order in Council and the law comes back automatically to what it is at the present time. I am not asking the House or the Government to amend the Tariff Act. I am simply asking that as a measure of justice to my constituents during the present season—and the crop is being harvested now—an Order in Council be passed, placing us in a position to send our product to our only market, and realize therefore the best price available. I think that with the quantity of potatoes in the Maritime Provinces to-day, which must be sent to the United States and Cuba—which for the purpose of my argument is the same thing—it will mean at least $400,000 that we would save which otherwise will have to go into the coffers of the United States. This is a lot of money, and means a great deal to the farmers of eastern Canada.

I do not think I have anything further to say upon the subject. I have tried to discuss it in a fair, non-partisan and business-like manner. I have pointed out the conditions existing, I have pointed out the law as it is, and indicated the remedy. I simply ask the Government to give us the remedy for the present year. You need not change the Tariff Act. I sincerely hope the Government will take these representations into consideration, not within the next month or six weeks, but immediately, and will pass the necessary Order in Council so that our people may get the best price possible for their product. We shall have no market in Ontario, in Quebec, or anywhere else except in the United States and Cuba, barring, of course, a few thousand bushels—a mere bagatelle—that go to the West Indies.

Mr. J. W. EDWARDS (Frontenac): Last year when the potato crop became a somewhat serious question in the province of Ontario, I obtained some figures in regard to the production of that very important vegetable, which figures I would like to submit for the consideration of the House. Potatoes are entirely different from wheat. What I mean by that is I do not think the hon. member for Carleton (Mr. Carvell) is quite logical in saying that inasmuch as the Government removed the duty from wheat and wheat products, they should for the same reason remove the duty on potatoes. Wheat will keep from one year to the next; potatoes must, practically speaking, be disposed of in the year they are grown; they will not keep indefinitely. The price of wheat is not fixed in Canada, but in Great Britain. This is not the case with potatoes, the price of which is regulated by the supply on this side of the Atlantic. I think my hon. friend also makes a mistake in assuming that the only market the Maritime Provinces will have for their potatoes is in the United States and Cuba. I think he is mistaken in assuming they will have a market for their surplus potatoes in the United States. Let us look at the figures of the production of this very important article for the years 1915 and 1916, and compare the production in those two years.

In 1915 the total yield of potatoes in Canada was 62,604,000 bushels. In 1916 it was only 61,128,000 bushels, or a decrease of 1,476,000 bushels. Let us see where that shortage took place. It did not take place in the Maritime Provinces. Prince Edward Island produced 2,828,000 bushels more in 1916 than in 1915; Nova Scotia produced 2,185,000 bushels more than in 1915; and New Brunswick 1,716,000 bushels more than in 1915. That is to say, the Maritime Provinces in 1916 showed an increased production over 1915 of 6,729,000 bushels of potatoes. The province of Ontario, how-

ever, in 1916 showed a shortage of 6,250,000 bushels from the production of the previous year; while Quebec showed a shortage of 2,800,000 bushels. Thus the shortage in Ontario and Quebec more than overbalanced the increased production in the three Maritime provinces. Under normal conditions Quebec and Ontario should have supplied a market for the over-production of the Maritime Provinces. Let us look at the production in the West. Manitoba showed an increased production in 1916 over 1915 of 1,600,000 bushels, and Saskatchewan an increase of 850,000 bushels, while Alberta showed a shortage of 500,000 bushels and British Columbia a shortage of 1,100,000 bushels, as compared with the previous year. In other words, Ontario and Quebec together showed a decrease from the previous year's production of over 9,000,000 bushels; the western provinces showed an increase over the production of the previous year of 850,000 bushels; while the Maritime Provinces showed an increase of 6,729,000 bushels. We were in the position, in Ontario, and in Quebec to a lesser extent, of having a very great shortage in a very important crop. Ordinarily we would have been helped out in Ontario by the Quebec crop, which as a rule is quite large. We did not have an opportunity to bring potatoes from the western provinces, although they showed some increase.

The United States in 1916 showed a shortage of 75,000,000 bushels from the previous year. There seemed to be a general shortage on this continent except in the Maritime Provinces and one or two western provinces. In England there was a shortage of 13,250,000 bushels; in Ireland, a great potato producing country, a shortage of over 47,000,000 bushels; and in Scotland a shortage of over 6,500,000 bushels; while the potato crop was also short in Italy and Switzerland. Totalling the figures, we find a shortage in Canada, the United States and the United Kingdom in 1916 as compared with that of 1915 of 153,000,000 bushels. Consequently for any surplus that we had in the western provinces or in the Maritime Provinces we had a very serious competitor in the United States. There was a shortage throughout the United States, and consequently a demand for potatoes from any source. Taking one year with another, the nineteen northern states, the principal potato producing states of the Union, produce over 60 per cent of the crop of potatoes in the United States. But they fell away below the average in 1916—some 44 per cent—and more than 50 per cent below the average of the previous five years.

Let us consider this for a moment. The situation in Ontario last fall was this: There was a great shortage of potatoes here and the prices went up rapidly. I could have bought all the potatoes I wanted about potato digging time in the fall for $2 a bag. But, like every person else, I thought that price was pretty high; it was a great deal higher than we had been accustomed to paying in Ontario, and people held back and did not put in a supply. The cold weather came on and we could not bring potatoes from the Maritime Provinces or from the West without risk of frost and the price went up out of sight. That explains the high price of potatoes in Ontario and Quebec last year.

My hon. friend seems to think—and I do not wish to question his sincerity in the matter—that the solution of the difficulty, so far as the Maritime Provinces are concerned, is the removal of duty so that potatoes may pass readily from the United States into Canada or from Canada into the United States. I do not agree in that conclusion. I recognize that the potato crop in the Maritime Provinces is a very important crop, and I suppose that if the potato growers in the Maritime Provinces were making an average of $500 an acre, or a clear profit of $20,000 on every forty acres of potatoes, they would not do much grumbling whether they had a duty or not. I do not suppose the hon. member wants us to infer that they are making that on the average. I will admit that in the ordinary year there will be little prospect of Maritime Province potatoes coming in any great quantity into the province of Quebec.

There will be a greater market in Ontario than in Quebec. I know that Maritime Province potatoes have come into Ontario for years and years, I think to a larger extent than into Quebec, because we raise less potatoes in Ontario than they do in Quebec. But, in view of the fact that they have just as good soil for raising potatoes in the United States as we have in Canada, and that the principal potato producing states in the Union are the Northern States, which produce over 60 per cent of the total output of that country, taking one year with another, where is there going to be any relief? If we happen to have a shortage in Ontario and Quebec, as we had last year, there will be just as good a market in Ontario and Quebec for Maritime Province potatoes as in the United States. If there happens to be a shortage in the United

States, potatoes will go that way. On the other hand, in the United States, where, taking one year with the other, they have invariably a very large surplus—up in the millions of bushels—if the barriers are taken down, the potatoes will go from the United States into the Maritime Provinces, or other provinces of Canada, where ordinarily the Maritime Provinces would be looking for a market.

Mr. MACDONALD: We raise a surplus of potatoes in the Maritime Provinces.

Mr. CARVELL: It would be "carrying coals to Newcastle."

Mr. EDWARDS: If you say there will be no market for United States in the Maritime Provinces because you have more than you require, I say that, taking one year with another, the United States have more than they require for their own use, and taking potatoes to the United States will be "carrying coals to Newcastle." If the argument holds in one case it will hold good in the other. If the production of potatoes in the United States is chiefly confined to the Northern States, you have your competitors right at your door. Taking one year with another, there is a large surplus of potatoes in the United States. They are looking for a market. They ship their potatoes to all parts of the world, wherever they can find a market for them The position is somewhat similar in regard to hay. You will see a great difference in the price of hay, sometimes a dollar or two a ton, within a distance of a hundred miles. There will be a remarkable difference in the quotations at Toronto and the quotations at Guelph. Locality cuts a bigger figure in fixing the price of potatoes than anything you can name. In various parts of Ontario the price of potatoes varies greatly. Potatoes were selling at $4 a bag in Kingston when you could buy all you wanted in Pembroke for $2.75 or $3 a bag, and Pembroke is only a short distance away. But they happened to have a very good crop in that locality There will not be the relief the hon. gentleman anticipates from the removal of the duty.

The hon. gentleman may say "what objection have you? If it is not going to be much of a relief it is not going to be much of a damage." That is a fair argument, but my main objection is a question of principle. I think if we accede to the demand from one section of the country, for instance from the Maritime Provinces, in regard to potatoes, another section of the country will make a demand in regard to some product which abounds in that section. I do not think that is a good practice to follow. I maintain that we have to take into consideration climatic conditions. The climate of this country and the climate of the country with which we have to deal have to be considered. Our farmers are handicapped in this time of world competition because we compete with countries thousands of miles away which formerly we did not consider rivals. We must take into consideration the climate of Argentina, for instance, and the climate of certain parts of the United States, if we are going to be true to our own people. I say it is not a proper principle to enunciate that we should have free trade with this country, or free trade with that country. It might be all right, if conditions were alike in other respects, but the tariff is a means to a certain extent, of equalizing conditions which are rendered unequal because of a rigorous climate in one case and a mild climate in another. In Ontario and Quebec we have to provide against the frost, whereas our competitors to the south of us do not have that expense, by reason of the mildness of their climate. I do not think there will be anything like the relief the hon. member anticipates by making potatoes free, and I think it is introducing a dangerous principle.

Mr. HUGHES (Kings P.E.I.): The hon. member for Carleton (Mr. Carvell) deserves a great deal of credit for bringing this question to the notice of the House and asking the Government to take some action immediately to relieve the situation in the Maritime provinces. We in the Maritime provinces--and I speak more particularly for Prince Edward Island—did not feel the necessity for a market in the United States during the past two years for our potatoes but conditions this year are such that there is practically no other market for the surplus product of the Maritime provinces. We either have to sell in the United States, or not sell at all, because potatoes are not wanted in Ontario, or in the western provinces, or in any part of Quebec. A small quantity may, and probably will, be wanted in Newfoundland, but only a small proportion of what we have to dispose of, and, therefore, the market of the United States is the only market we have in the universe.

There is a market in that country for our surplus potatoes—not at a high price this

year, but at some price, because 90,000,000 or 100,000,000 people consume an enormous quantity of potatoes. I believe that the crop in the United States this year is estimated at about 420,000,000 bushels. The member for Carleton estimates—I think his estimate is low—that we shall have a surplus crop in Canada of 10,000,000 bushels. There will be a surplus crop of 6,000,000 or 7,000,000 in the Maritime Provinces, 3,000,000 of which will be produced in Prince Edward Island. Of course, we can feed some of this surplus crop to the stock, but there is not enough stock to consume anything like the whole of it. The crop this year will be as good as that of last year, when we had a splendid market in Ontario, in some parts of Quebec and in the United States. Ontario seldom takes any considerable quantity of potatoes from the Maritime Provinces, at any rate from Prince Edward Island; ordinarily they produce almost enough for themselves. In order to produce potatoes or any other commodity successfully, a steady market is much more necessary than a market that may give a high price one year and an exceedingly low price the next two or three years. That is one reason why the market of the United States, so far as potatoes are concerned, is so valuable to the farmers of the Maritime Provinces. When the importing country is very short of the product imported and must get it at any price, the importer pays a large portion of the duty. But when conditions in a country like the United States are such as they are this year; when they have a large crop and do not find it necessary to import our potatoes, then the exporter pays the duty on potatoes sent into that country. Why is it that we can find a market in the United States for our surplus potatoes? Because of the fact that eight or ten million bushels of potatoes more or less will make no appreciable difference in a country which has a crop of over 400,000,000 bushels. The United States market will not be greatly affected by our surplus potatoes being sent into that country; therefore they can take our surplus produce, at some price.

Mr. CARVELL: And they are taking it.

Mr. J. J. HUGHES: And they are taking it; as a matter of fact it is the only place to which we can ship our potatoes at this time. The farmers of Prince Edward Island will get a very low price for their potato crop this year, no matter what the Government may do, and an addition of five or six cents a bushel to the price that they would otherwise get would be of immense benefit to them. A few days ago I happened to be in Boston and, talking to some potato buyers there, I noticed that in figuring up the price that they could pay for potatoes, they invariably deducted the duty. I do not see any reason why the Government should refuse to grant the concession asked for on behalf of the farmers of the Maritime provinces. In the month of April last the Government by their provision for free wheat, gave the farmers of the West access to the United States market for that staple product. Every body admits that that was a great advantage to the western farmer; it was asked for by representative men from western Canada, grain growers and other bodies, as well as members of Parliament representing that part of the country. The right to send wheat and wheat products into the United States free of duty must be of great advantage to the people of this country, otherwise these strong representations would not have been made in favour of Government action. Why, then, does the Government hesitate to act now? I trust that the Government will not hesitate further; I do not think that on principle they can reasonably do so. They should not hesitate to relieve the farmers of eastern Canada and the maritime provinces of the payment into the United States treasury of at least $400,000. I am satisfied that the removal of the duty upon potatoes entering the United States this year would mean $150,000 to the farmers of Prince Edward Island.

Mr. EDWARDS: Does my hon. friend contend that the maritime province farmer pays the duty imposed by the United States if he sends his potatoes into that country?

Mr. J. J. HUGHES: I certainly do, under present conditions. The member for Carleton stated most emphatically that the difference between the price of potatoes in New Brunswick and the price of potatoes in Maine, across the boundary line, is simply the amount of the duty.

Mr. CARVELL: I am a potato grower myself, and I keep in close touch with matters of this kind. I say most emphatically that there never was a time during the last two or three years—during the last five years, for that matter—when potatoes in the State of Maine, ten miles from my home, were not worth more than potatoes in my country just to the extent of the duty. Even when potatoes were worth $7 a barrel in my town, they were worth $7.70 to $8 a barrel ten miles away in the State of Maine. No matter whether the price is

high or low, the difference between the price in the State of Maine and the price in the county of Carleton is simply the amount of the duty.

Mr. WRIGHT: Is it not a fact that my hon. friend and others on his side of the House have constantly argued that when products are imported from the State of Maine into Montreal and other parts of Quebec, the consumer invariably pays the duty, and that if they go the other way the exporter pays the duty? Hon. gentlemen are advancing a double-barrelled argument.

Mr. CARVELL: I have not the right to argue the matter now, but I have stated upon a pretty good business knowledge of the facts what the condition is as it exists to-day in regard to the marketing of our own potato crop.

Mr. J. J. HUGHES: The hon. member for Carleton has answered the question proposed by the hon. member for Frontenac (Mr. Edwards) and the question proposed by the hon. member for Muskoka (Mr. Wright). I stated in the early part of my remarks—I think the hon. member for Frontenac was not paying attention—that, under the conditions we had last year when potatoes were a necessity in the United States, when the crop there was exceedingly small as compared with the crop in Canada, when they had to get potatoes almost at any price, they paid the duty; but under present conditions, when they are under no necessity whatever of importing our potatoes and when we are under the necessity of sending our potatoes into the United States if we are to sell them at all, I believe we take the price less the duty; that is, we pay the duty.

Mr. EDWARDS: That is, when they have more potatoes of their own than they want

Mr. HUGHES: More than they want, but not more than they can use.

Mr. EDWARDS: That is what your argument comes to.

Mr. HUGHES: That is a matter that my hon. friends can convert into an academic question if they want to do so, but at the present time we are up against a condition and not a theory. The United States is the only country in the world in which we can dispose of our surplus product this year. My hon. friend from Frontenac stated a few moments ago that we should not expect a market in the United States for potatoes for the reason that the nineteen northern States constitute a large potato growing area which is very similar in climatic and soil conditions to the Maritime Provinces—I think that was his argument. Straitway however, he claimed that we could get a market in Ontario whose climatic and other conditions are surely more like those of the Maritime Provinces than are those of the United States. There is a good deal of similarity between the northern States and Canada in regard to soil and climatic conditions, but the northern States of the United States find a market for their surplus product in those southern States that do not produce sufficient potatoes for their own use. The need thus created by the sending of potatoes from the northern States to the South leaves a market for our potatoes in the northern States.

Reference was made by the hon. member for Carleton to the embargo placed by the United States upon our potatoes in 1913 when the Government of that country thought our potatoes were diseased.

Mr. EDWARDS: Does the hon. member really think they thought that?

Mr. HUGHES: I do.

Mr. CARVELL: I do not. I know personally the men who put up the whole game.

Mr. HUGHES: I hold the Americans were justified in so thinking because our Government so informed them. That was more than a mistake on the part of our Government—it was a crime.

Mr. BURRELL: My hon. friend is making rather strong statements which I am afraid he cannot substantiate.

Mr. HUGHES: But I can substantiate them. In the autumn of 1913, when this matter was being considered at Washington, an officer of the Department of Agriculture attended the conference there and stated that our potatoes had the disease known as powdery scab. The inference, therefore, was that those potatoes should be excluded from the American market, and the Americans took us at our word. The Department of Agriculture sent men called professors to Prince Edward Island. I do not know whether they went to the other Maritime Provinces.

Mr. CARVELL: They did go—right into the cellars.

Mr. HUGHES: Those professors claimed they found a disease there. Events, how-

ev r, have proved that there was no disease. When those gentlemen who knew the Latin names of plants—and that I am afraid is all they did know—came amongst us and told us that our potatoes were greatly infected with powdery scab, we, in our innocence, thought they were telling us facts.

Mr. EDWARDS: My hon. friend has stated that in the fall of 1913, the Department of Agriculture of the Dominion of Canada sent a man down to Washington, and that at a conference there he told the authorities that our potatoes had the disease known as powdery scab. Will he give us the name of the official so that we can trace the matter up? I doubt the accuracy of his statement very much.

Mr. HUGHES: I am not responsible for the fact that my hon. friend doubts the accuracy of my statement. I am prepared to hear him make such a remark, but I will give him the name of the official, and then, perhaps, he will not be such a doubting Thomas.

Mr. EDWARDS: That is the best way to get at it.

Mr. HUGHES: If my hon. friend had asked me for the name without expressing a doubt as to the accuracy of my statement, it would have been more gentlemanly. The name of that official is Dr. Gussow.

Mr. CARVELL: A gentleman who will not have a vote at the next election.

Mr. HUGHES: I was making a few remarks about those gentlemen who came to our province to tell us that we had diseased potatoes. During the last year or two, and particularly during last year, we have not seen one of those professors in that province, and at the same time we have not seen or heard of powdery scab. The professors took their departure and the powdery scab went at the same time. To illustrate what those gentlemen knew about the business, I think it was in the fall of 1912, fairly late in the season, that two of them visited a farm in Brudenell in which potatoes are largely grown, and they inspected the cellar of Robert Stewart. I am just mentioning the names so that there will be no mistake about the matter. They told him his potatoes were badly diseased with powdery scab; that under no circumstances should he use them for seed, and that if he did so, he would not only ruin his own farm but greatly injure all the farms in the neighbourhood. The next year two other potato professors came along and this time they came in the month of September. When they visited us in the previous year the potatoes were all dug and in the root houses or in the cellars. On this occasion, they inspected the fields. Mr. Stewart had paid no attention to the two professors who visited him in 1912. He knew there was no disease in his potatoes more than there had been for forty years. He planted the same seed. The next year when these other two gentlemen came there, they gave him a clean Bill of health. They said that his was the only farm in the neighbourhood that had no disease.

Mr. CARVELL: Were those two professors the same men that visited the place the year before?

Mr. HUGHES: No—two other professors. I think it was in the fall of 1913 two gentlemen came to the province and I remember their names. They were Prof. Adams and Prof. Holmes or Holmden. Professor Adams came from Ireland, and knew all about powdery scab and diseased potatoes generally. He led off by telling the farmers what caused the disease, and among other things mentioned that a moist climate and lime in the soil were both favourable to the disease. He said that the disease would likely be prevalent in Prince Edward Island owing to our damp climate, but the fact of there being no lime in our soil was in our favour. The next professor who came to the platform told the assembled farmers how to eradicate the disease if they were unfortunate enough to have it. It was a difficult thing to eradicate, he said. If a farmer crossed a field of potatoes that were infected with powdery scab, and did not scrape the soil off his boots when he left the field, he would likely carry the disease to another field. He must not use in any other field a plough or a harrow or any other implement that had been used in a field where there was powdery scab. He must stop growing potatoes on that land for five, or six, or seven years. One way of preventing the disease was to spray the root houses, or the places where the potatoes were stored, with a solution of formaldehyde. If that could not be obtained, the next best thing was to sprinkle the cellars and the outhouses with a lime whitewash, washing the ceilings with lime and water. I was present at the meeting and asked him how lime in the soil could produce the disease, and lime in the cellar kill it. He said he would answer that question the next evening, but the next evening he was

thirty miles away. I was there, however, and asked him the same question, and he said that the chairman should not allow questions of that kind to be put, but only nice, easy questions. These and many other incidents that I could mention so disgusted the farmers with the professors who came to enlighten them that they absolutely refused to listen to them. Fortunately, none of those gentlemen have visited us for the last year or two. I do not know whether these professors are still in the department or what they are doing, but if the minister has no use for them, I would suggest that he send them to the war. He has not sent them to our province for the last year or two, and the people are very much pleased in consequence.

The point I wish to bring to the minister's attention is this: it is of the very greatest importance that under present conditions every obstacle to the free entry of our surplus potatoes this year to the United States should be removed. The Government can remove all obstacles by an Order in Council taking the duty off American potatoes coming into Canada, and if it is found desirable to revoke that Order in Council next year it could be done, but I do not believe it would be done. It is a most important thing for the people of the Maritime Provinces, and particularly for the farmers of Prince Edward Island, to have free access to the United States market for their surplus potatoes. Prince Edward Island is admirably adapted for growing potatoes. We have a friable, loamy soil, easily drained, no extremes of heat or cold, and an abundance of sea manure in the bays and rivers obtainable without money cost by fifty per cent of our farmers. It is the most profitable crop our farmers have, and the farmer himself is the best judge of that. There is no industry to which he will so readily give his labour as the growing of potatoes, provided he is reasonably certain of a fair price every year, and that, I maintain, can only be assured by having free access, or as nearly as possible, to the American market. I sincerely trust the Government will carefully consider this matter in the light of present conditions. If they will only treat the farmers of the Maritime Province in the same
11 p.m. way that they have treated the farmers in the prairie provinces, if they will only give us the same chance, we shall be satisfied.

Mr. L. A. LAPOINTE (St. James, Montreal) (Translation): Mr. Speaker, from the discussion which has been going on from both sides of this House about potatoes and other food stuffs, I am led to believe that I may pertinently discuss here and now the high cost of living.

Upon that subject, indeed, I have heard in this House, for at least four or five months past, most elaborate speeches well supported by documents. For my part, I believe something should be done without any further delay in order to control the cost of living in this country.

When this question was debated, some have sided with the farmers, fearing that the latter could not sell their produce high enough, and others did assert that the farmers were in no way at fault, but that the blame should be laid upon the forestaller or middlemen, upon the cold storage proprietors, etc. In fine, many arguments, but no solution.

A food controller, it is true, has been appointed. He has been in office for three months already. Has he succeeded in doing anything? No!

On this very day, he is sitting in Toronto, together with some experts appointed by the Government to investigate into the O'Connor report; but, meanwhile, matters are becoming serious in Montreal, where the population is getting stirred up and certain newspapers, La Presse among others, are beginning a campaign in favour of the citizens of Montreal.

In its evening edition of to-day, Mr. Speaker, La Presse says:

> According to calculations made recently and based upon excellent data, there were, in the beginning of September, in the various Canadian Cold Storage warehouses, 14,948,540 dozens of eggs; 20,480,809 lbs of butter; 19,693,704 lbs of cheese; 13,648,782 lbs of beef; fresh or frozen; 566,895 lbs of corn beef; 10,302,645 lbs of pork, fresh or frozen; 19,689,874 lbs of cured pork; 1,619,137 lbs of ham; 10,856,548 lbs of lard; 1,543,558 lbs of bacon; 15,546,732 lbs of fish; 1,844,207 lbs of poultry. These figures, which show to what extent the provision forestalling is going on throughout the country, become even more eloquent when compared to those of the previous year, and indeed everybody knows how little restraint was shown in 1916, by the monopolizers in their work of accumulating provisions in their cold storage plants to the detriment of the consumers. These quantities are held in 180 cold storage plants, that is 88 per cent of the total number of warehouses. In 1916, the stored up quantities were as follows: eggs, 9,713,824 dozen; butter, 11,960,164 lbs; cheese, 12,251,431 lbs; beef, 8,373,037 lbs, pork, 20,194,226 lbs; bacon and ham, 9,838,981 lbs; fish, 6,926,991.
>
> In the face of such figures, there is no wonder if from every section of Canada alarming cries are being raised. There is no wonder that our leading citizens, as shown in the interviews we have published yesterday and by those we are giving out to-day, are asking Mr.

Hanna, the food controller, to come at last to a decision and adopt stringent measures in order to stop this forestalling and make it so we can get foodstuffs at prices somewhat less inaccessible.

The commission appointed by the Government to investigate the report made by Mr. W. F. O'Connor, the high cost of living commissioner, as to the prices of bacon and of ham, opened its sittings yesterday in the Toronto City Hall. A preliminary meeting had already been held six weeks ago. The whole session was taken up yesterday, just to receive the reports of the Government auditors who have been, for the past six weeks, examining the books of the William Davies Co., for the period extending from 1913 to March 1917. The reports show an enormous increase both in the volume of the transactions and in the profits realized since the beginning of the war. Mr. C. E. Fox, the company's general manager, has declared that the company's surplusages have been, leaving out the deductions to be made, of $340,905 in 1913; $377,350 in 1914; $906,428 in 1915; $1,757,180 in 1916; and of $1,723,600 for the present year. The profits have been as follows: in 1913, $166,826; 1914, $164,665; 1915, $580,750; 1916, $1,539,473; 1917, $1,379,904.

When Mr. Fox was asked how it was that bacon was being sold at a lower price in England than in Canada, he simply replied that the quality was not quite the same.

Mr. Contant, ex-chairman of the Montreal Board of Trade, a man of some standing, gives a very simple interview, but it is most timely and to the point. He says: "The matter is very simple, nothing for us, but everything for overseas."

That is true. We have been discussing here, and we are still discussing all the time, the best means to adopt in order to transport the provisions across the ocean. A few minutes ago, the tariff question came up; some fear that it might be taken away, as far as potatoes are concerned. They pretend to discuss the foodstuff question from the agricultural and trade standpoint, but the fact is the only object in view is to favour transportation more or less, nothing else.

Mr. Contant further says:

Mr. Hanna has done nothing, or, rather, I believe he has done something, but not for us. He seems to have only one concern, that is that they may not be wanting in any way, in England. But, as to the cost of eatables here!

Mr. Alphonse Racine, one of Montreal's largest merchants and a number of the consulting board of the Food Commission, also speaks in the same sense. He says that nothing is being done.

This question, says he, cannot be discussed without a careful study. But, if you speak about coal, I think I am in a position to tell you that our supply is at present larger than it was last year, at the same date. Besides, I think I may also state that the fuel controller has taken the necessary means to secure us the coal we shall need this winter. You may say that coal is not scarcer than last year, but on the contrary it is in larger quantity and that those who believe in a dearth are mistaken.

However, Mr. Speaker, coal is selling at exorbitant prices in Montreal. Why cannot these gentlemen agree upon an acceptable price?

Mr. J. A. Paulhus.

The manager of the firm D. Hatton Company cannot see of what use has been the appointment of Mr. Hanna as food controller. "There will always be only one way to settle those question of high prices," says he, "it is the simple move of demand and supply. If the people think certain foodstuffs are being sold to them too high, there is a very simple remedy, let them refuse to buy any food costing too dear, such as eggs, and let them buy something else. The food forestallers who are asking too big prices shall then be compelled to come down. But why do not the people buy fish in larger quantities? Fish costs less than meat and it is easily digested."

Mr. J. E. Normandin.

Mr. J. E. Normandin, of the Normandin Optical Co., says that he has vainly tried to find it out, he cannot yet see what good the food controller, Mr. Hanna, has done for the country. "It is evident," says he, "that he has thought more often of the oversea people than of the citizens of Canada."

The opinion of the mayor of Montreal is also well known. It has been recorded more than once. Many a time, he has risen up in this House to criticize, more or less, the way the public are being treated as to the cost of living.

The Mayor's opinion.

Before leaving for Ottawa, yesterday afternoon, the mayor of Montreal had time enough to say a few words to the representative of La Presse on the food question.

As all those who have thus far spoken to us, he was most explicit in his declaration and stated he was much dissatisfied with the methods followed by the food dictator, methods which he considers both inefficient and too lacking in vigour.

"It is not sufficient," said he, "to tell the consumers: 'On such and such a day, you shall eat so and so.' They must, moreover, be put in a position to follow such advice, by seeing to it, that the prices be not too high and by preventing the improper forestalling which causes a fictitious scarcity of available supplies.

"He should have forbidden the slaughtering of young cattle, of calves, lambs and young pigs, in order to maintain the herds.

"He should also have prevented the trusts from accumulating foodstuffs in cold storage, thus leaving them in sufficient quantities so that the prices be not raised too high. And then, there is no need waiting after the trusts for lowering those prices: the Government and the food dictator have full power to lower them themselves. But nothing of the kind has been done.

"Nothing has been efficiently regulated. They were satisfied to bother the people by asking them not to eat of this nor of that, while the articles of which they are deprived are verily more plentiful than ever, such as beef and bacon. The latter article cannot even be exported to England any more. Then, whom do they want

to favour, by preventing the Canadian consumers from buying it?

"And meanwhile, all the provisions are reaching incredible prices. A single Montreal dealer has thousands of eggs in storage and we must pay them as high as sixty cents a dozen. Potatoes are being sold at ridiculous prices.

"The lack of real control of victuals is a sinister farce, a national crime."

Alderman Dubeau.

"The war has been lasting more than three years," remarked the representative of Lafontaine Ward, "and during all that time, the Government have done nothing, either to prevent the rise in the prices for provisions, or to regulate their price, such as it has been successfully done by the Food dictators in France and in England. Recently, realizing that general elections were soon at hand, the Government have appointed a food dictator, to befool the people into believing that conditions would soon be improved. Mr. Hanna has been in office for several months already and not a single article of food has fallen in price: on the contrary, several have gone up, such as milk, eggs, etc. He has ordered meatless days: that has been a failure. He has prohibited the use of bacon: England wants no more of it. The bacon accumulates in the warehouses and the price is kept high. Some have asked the introduction of oleomargarine, on account of the high price of butter: the Government refuse. In fine, the food controller, up to date, has been an immense humbug!"

Alderman Vandelac.

The representative of St. Jean-Baptiste Ward protested against the fact that the store-house owners hoard up foodstuffs, allow them to deteriorate and even to rot completely, while the Government are doing nothing to take advantage of that abundance in bringing about a decline in prices.

"Certain store-house owners," did he assert, "keep these establishments full all the time. They have sheds in the country-places, where they put the surplus which could not find any room in the city storage plants. Thus, they always have an abundant supply from which they take only what is strictly necessary for consumption, so that the prices don't go down and that the consumer be forced to give his last cent to feed and clothe himself and his family."

Alderman Blumenthal.

The representative of St. Louis Ward straightforwardly declared that the Government was taking the wrong course in the food control question.

"They are incessantly talking of over production," said he, "but that is hardly necessary, for we produce in abundance and more so. Let them now tell us about an equitable distribution among the people of the results of that production. It is all right to export and to leave us only what we need: nobody complains of that. But where just recriminations are heard, that is when we are asked exorbitant prices for every thing sold us, without any possible justification as to any scarcity whatever in the foodstuffs.

"Let us take fish, for instance: is there any thing more common? Anything which can be procured with a smaller effort? And, yet, the Government permit it to be sold at ridiculously exaggerated prices. It is about time to put a stop to this."

It is true that Mr. Hanna, the food controller, advises us to eat fish, to buy fish; he goes as far as telling us it is easily digestible; but, Mr. Speaker, fish is as dear to-day, if not dearer than meat. I do not know what the matter is, but fish is controlled in some way, or the Government do not facilitate its transportation from the Maritime Provinces to Montreal and other ports of the country.

There are still other interviews in the article of La Presse which I have just read. There is that of Mr. Arthur Lamothe, secretary of the Carpenters and Joiners District Council; those of Mr. Alfred Côté, of Mr. J. A. Laflamme, of Mr. Moïse Printemps, of Mr. Edmond Berthiaume, of Mr. N. Lafleur and of Mr. O. Proulx. All are in the same sense as those I have just quoted.

There is at present in Montreal a feeling of indignation on that subject, and in the editorial of La Presse, that feeling is well described. I am anxious to see it entered in Hansard, so that the whole country may know it.

A COMEDY WHICH IS BECOMING DIGUSTING.

The general clamour against the food dictator is still increasing; that outcry rises from the suffering masses who have not, unconsciously or unwillingly, been protected against the odious speculations of which they are the victims, as much if not more than ever before. And the Government who has appointed Mr. Hanna is, naturally held responsible for the inertness of its own creature. It is no longer a feeling of ordinary discontent, it is one of wrath, of that popular wrath provoked by badly kept or discarded promises, by deluded expectations, by indefinitely tolerated extortions, by an unbridled debauchery of forestalling, by the impudent arrogance of the trusts directly or indirectly encouraged, by the deplorable manner of proceeding on the part of the food dictatorship, that seems solely, engrossed in preserving for speculation the most needed alimentary articles, without any concern whether, tomorrow, the working man, at home, will not starve, or whether the small-salaried people will not die of starvation, on account of not being able to get the food they need.

Threatens to resign.

Mr. Hanna is being censured even by members of his advisory staff. Thus it is that Alderman Weldon, who represents the city of Montreal upon the consultative board of the food dictator, is not afraid to publicly declare that his office is more honorary than honourable, and that he will promptly offer his resignation, if he is not very soon given an opportunity to help along his fellow-citizens and his country. He does not consider that the food control, such as it is now operating, is actually helpful nor efficient. It acts far too slowly, without any appreciable result for the consumer.

The workingmen are deceived.

On his part, Commissioner Ainey declares that Mr. Hanna's inertness is to be regretted. When the Montreal Trades and Labour Council asked for the appointment of a dictator, it was in order that the latter, not only regulate the export conditions and the food distribution, but also that he should fix prices in such a way as to put a check on the unbridled speculation of

the profiteers. The workingmen have been deceived in their legitimate expectations.

A deadly trick.

Commissioner Côté qualifies the food dictator's appointment as a "deadly trick," whilst in public meetings, in Montreal, the Government is charged with becoming the accomplice of the speculators and of the profiteers, letting Mr. Hanna starve the people, while prices are on the rise and foodstuffs are being hoarded in the cold storage warehouses.

An odious accumulation.

The public are justified in demanding that the foodstuff prices be regulated, especially so when they are imposing upon them restrictions from which they are already suffering enough on account of the excessive prices exacted from them for articles of prime necessity. What occult power is there to prevent Mr. Hanna from doing his duty, or what are the influences that cause him to hesitate between the protection the consumers are entitled to and the speculators' interests? The Order in Council which has appointed him dictator, gives him full power to investigate the prices of provisions and also to regulate them; what use is there for him to preach us the great principle of demand and supply, when he knows that this economic equilibrium has ceased to exist, ever since the beginning of the war, that it has been destroyed by the very people who are making a greater show of it in order to impose upon us more odiously. Is it reasonable, for instance, to pay bacon fifty cents a pound, in order that Mr. Flavelle may realize, in 1917, the enormous gain of $1,397,903, when such profits had seemed satisfactory, in 1913, when they were $16,826? Why does Mr. Hanna allow the hoarding of foodstuffs in the profiteers' cold storage plants, when the prices are always going up? On the 1st of September, indeed, 130 cold storage plants, throughout the country, contained 14,948,540 dozen of eggs; 20,480,809 lbs of butter; 19,693,704 lbs of cheese; 14,215,677 lbs of beef; 29,989,515 lbs of pork; 14,019,243 lbs of lard; leaving out mutton, lamb, fish and poultry, of which large quantities will be lost through the fact of not marketing them in time.

I have already stated, when I began these remarks, the quantities of pork hoarded in these establishments.

During the same time, the food dictator puts on the salaried lists specialists in domestic economy to prepare bills of fare for our housewives, when the greater part of the foods set down on these menus are inaccessible to ordinary purses, and are no longer, on account of their exorbitant cost, to be seen on the table of a large number of workingmen and of petty employees. Wheat porridge, with milk and sugar, has become a luxury; milk is hardly sufficient for infants' food, when some can be had, and sugar is only used to sweeten the bitter taste of light tea. The ham and eggs which figures on the bill of fare of a "war breakfast" prepared by the domestic economy specialists of the food dictator, is a sort of heart-rending irony, with eggs at 60 cents a dozen and ham at about the same price a pound; it is a pasha's dish. And what about roast beef, roast veal, pork chops, poached eggs, butter for gravies, marmalades which have doubled in price in less than a year; green peas, the canning of which is forbidden; onions which are only sold by the pound; fruits which cost much dearer than their nutritive value; syrups, which we must give up because it takes sugar to make them, and molasses which has become a luxury.

All these articles, however, are to be found on the economic menus of the food dictator, prepared for the benefit of our Canadian housewives, without even attempting to give them a chance to buy at a reasonable price what is needed to make up those bills of fare.

Is such a comedy not becoming most outrageous?

I have taken much time, Mr. Speaker, but I was anxious to lay such a state of affairs before the eyes of the public, and I shall continue to do so until the end of the session. On that point, I have the support of all those who suffer and who pay, not only of the Montreal population, but of the whole of Canada. I contend that this Parliament has not gone far enough to relieve the people on that stand. I say Parliament, for we also, on the Opposition side, have had some faults, but the blame is especially upon the Government side. We have spoken too often, Mr. Speaker, but have done very little.

We have often heard, for instance, the hon. Prime Minister (Sir Robert Borden), the hon. Minister of Agriculture (Mr. Burrell), the hon. Minister of Trade and Commerce (Sir George Foster) and the hon. Minister of Labour (Mr. Crothers), making fine speeches of economic trend upon this question of high cost of living; all have made nice promises, the whole matter was to be settled. Everything has been settled, that is true, but in the manner described by Mr. Contant, that is to say, every thing has been settled to cross the ocean. Whether it be the fault of the trusts or of these hoarding cold storage owners, in order to foresee a coming increase in prices, it matters little; for my part, I charge the Government with being the main cause of the evil. They are invested with full authority and they should have done their duty in the difficult circumstances we are going through. They should have done more than appoint a man who does nothing but go to and from Quebec to Toronto, from Toronto to Victoria and from Winnipeg to Vancouver, just to look over reports made by certain people whom he has called upon to check and control certain facts; he does not, however, take the trouble to fix the price of such or such article of foodstuff necessary to mere living. In a word, he is satisfied in doing nothing.

As I have just stated I shall not lose a simple opportunity, from now until the end of the session, even to-morrow perhaps, to draw the Government's attention upon this subject and to communicate to the House

newspaper extracts, in order to open the eyes of the Government upon this question.

Motion agreed to.

SUPPLY.

House again in Committee of Supply, Mr. Rainville in the Chair.

Excise—Salaries of officers and inspectors of excise, and to provide for increase depending on the result of excise examinations—further amount required, $25,000.

Mr. PROULX: Is there any provision in that for the appointment of new officers?

Mr. SEVIGNY: No, this is for increases only.

Progress reported.

WAGES OF EMPLOYEES OF RAILWAY COMPANIES—RAILWAY ACT AMENDMENT.

House in Committee on Bill No. 103, an Act concerning the payment of salaries or wages of employees of railway companies. Mr. D. Stewart in the Chair.

Mr. REID: I have a number of amendments to the Railway Act which I wish to insert in this Bill. The object is to have them in the Bill in case the Railway Bill should not pass the Senate. The first amendment is:

Paragraph (e) of clause 34 of section 2 of the said Act is amended by adding at the end thereof the following:
"including any such compensation payable under the provisions of any Act of the Parliament of Canada or of any provincial legislature providing for compensation to workmen for injuries or in respect of an industrial disease."

Mr. GRAHAM: As I understand it, the sections the minister is asking us to put in this Bill have already passed both Houses.

Mr. REID: Yes.

Mr. GRAHAM: And would be in the new Railway Act?

Mr. REID: If it passes. The intention is just to get this up to third reading, and if we find the Railway Act will not pass the Senate, then we will ask the House to give this the third reading and send it over to the Senate. On the other hand, if the Railway Bill passes the Senate we will not ask for the third reading of this Bill.

Mr. CARVELL: As we are providing in the general Railway Act that any of the provincial laws regarding compensation for workmen's injuries shall apply here, I wish to point out that I had a rather peculiar case in my own practice within the last week or ten days. A man was killed on the Transcontinental railway under conditions which in my judgment would be negligence on the part of the Government railways. I filed a notice of the accident with the Railway Department, as provided by our statute, and I received a very courteous letter from the department claiming that they were not subject to any laws of the province of New Brunswick regarding compensation, and therefore they returned my notice to me. It seems to me if the ordinary railways of the country are subject to the laws of the province for the protection of workmen, especially in such a serious matter as where a man is killed, such as was the case here, the Government railways should either be liable or should treat the matter as if they were liable.

Mr. REID: In the Railway Act that has passed both Houses that was included was it not?

Mr. CARVELL: The Government railways were not included in that. The understanding was that they were to be included, and then the officials of the department claimed it would require a separate Bill, and that Bill has not been introduced. The Government railways are still under the Government Railways Act. As we are providing for this very case in the Railway Act, it seems a hardship that the Government railways should not come under the same provision.

Mr. REID: I agree. It is a matter that may have to be taken up next session.

Amendment agreed to.

Mr. REID: I wish to move the following amendments:

Section 50 of the said Act is amended by adding the following at the end thereof:

"But where such regulation, order or decision requires any act, matter or thing to be done for the safety of the public or the employees of the railway no extension shall be granted without hearing on notice."

Subsection 1 of section 246 of the said Act is amended by inserting immediately after the word "maintained," in the third line thereof, the words "along or."

Section 269 of the said Act is amended by adding thereto the following paragraphs:

"(d) With respect to the length of sections required to be kept in repair by employees of the company, and with respect to the number of employees required for each section, so as to ensure safety to the public and to employees;

"(e) Limiting or regulating the hours of duty of any employees or class or classes of employees, with a view to the safety of the public and of employees; and

"(f) Providing that a specified kind of fuel or a specified kind of power or method or

means of propulsion shall be used on any or all locomotives and trains in any district."

Subsection 2 of section 274 of the said Act is repealed and the following is substituted therefor:

"(2) Where a municipal bylaw of a city or town prohibits such sounding of the whistle or such ringing of the bell in respect of any such crossing or crossings within the limits of such city or town, such bylaw shall, if approved by an order of the Board to the extent of such prohibition, relieve the company and its employees from the duty imposed by this section."

Subsection 1 of section 276 of the said Act is repealed and the following is substituted therefor:

"276. Whenever in any city, town or village, any train not headed by an engine is passing over or along a highway at rail level which is not adequately protected by gates or otherwise, the company shall station on that part of the train, which is then foremost, a person who shall warn persons standing on, or crossing, or about to cross the track of such railway."

Subsection 1 of section 292 of the said Act is amended by adding at the end thereof:

"Any conductors or other employees making a report to the company of the occurrence of any such accident shall as soon as possible after such accident notify the Board of the same by telegraph."

Section 300 of the said Act is repealed and the following is substituted therefor:

"300. (1) A superior or county court judge, two justices of the peace, or a stipendiary or police magistrate, in any part of Canada, a clerk of the peace, clerk of the Crown or judge of the sessions of the peace in the province of Quebec, within whose jurisdiction the railway runs, may, on the application of the company or any clerk or agent of the company, appoint any persons who are British subjects to act as constables on and along such railway.

"(2) Every person so appointed shall take an oath or make a solemn declaration, which may be administered by any judge or other official authorized to make the appointment or to administer oaths, in the form or to the effect following, that is to say:

"'I, A.B., having been appointed a constable to act upon and along (here name the railway), under the provisions of the Railway Act, do swear that I am a British subject; that I will well and truly serve our Sovereign Lord the King in the said office of constable, without favour or affection, malice or ill-will; that I will, to the best of my power, cause the peace to be kept, and prevent all offences against the peace; and that, while I continue to hold the said office, I will, to the best of my skill and knowledge, discharge the duties thereof faithfully according to law. So help me God.'

"(3) Such appointment shall be made in writing signed by the official making the appointment, and the fact that the person appointed thereby has taken such oath or declaration shall be endorsed on such written appointment by the person administering such oath or declaration."

Subsection 1 of section 306 of the said Act is amended by striking out the word "one" in the fifth line thereof, and substituting therefor the word "two."

Section 308 of the said Act is repealed and the following is substituted therefor:

[Mr. J. D. Reid.]

"308. The company may for the better enforcement of the observance of any such bylaw, rule or regulation, prescribe a penalty not exceeding forty dollars for any violation thereof, and such penalty shall be enforceable on summary conviction."

Subsection 3 of section 310 of the said Act is repealed and the following is substituted therefor:

"(3) No such bylaw, rule or regulation shall have any force or effect without such sanction or after such sanction has been rescinded."

Paragraph (d) of section 393 is repealed and the following is substituted therefor:

"(d) Whenever in any city, town or village, any train of the company not headed by an engine is allowed to pass over or along a highway at rail level which is not adequately protected by gates or otherwise, the company does not station on that part of the train, which is then foremost, a person who shall warn persons standing on or crossing or about to cross the track of such railway."

Section 394 of the said Act is amended by adding thereto the following subsection:

"(2) No employee shall be liable to such penalty if he proves that the carrying out or observing of the rules of the company was the cause of such obstruction, and in such case the company and its superintendent or other officer in charge of the operation of the railway, or of the division thereof upon which such obstruction occurs, shall each be guilty of the offence mentioned in this section and liable to a penalty not exceeding two hundred dollars."

Amendments agreed to.

Mr. MACDONALD: How does my hon. friend from East Lambton (Mr. J. E. Armstrong) feel about this? Is he satisfied?

Mr. REID: He feels all right.

Mr. MACDONALD: The minister who is talking just now has five portfolios around him, but he cannot speak for the member for East Lambton. He ought to let the member speak for himself.

Mr. GRAHAM: The minister is sure these amendments are all right in order?

Mr. CARVELL: I have checked them up, and they are all right.

Mr. REID: Mr. Gisborne assured me he had made an exact copy of the Bill as passed in the Senate, and he pinned the amendments in order as I have placed them before the committee. My understanding is that they are an exact copy. I should like to let the Bill stand for third reading, until we see what may happen in the Senate.

Mr. GRAHAM: It would have to go back to the Senate.

Mr. MACDONALD: Do you think it will have to go back to the Senate?

Mr. REID: I am not thinking anything.

Mr. MACDONALD: You ought to think. Do you think the other Bill is coming down, or do you think it is not?

Mr. REID: I hope so, but I want to be prepared.

Mr. MACDONALD: I do not think the hon. gentleman hopes so; I think he does not want it to go through.

Mr. GRAHAM: As a matter of fact they are divided over there. Part of the Senate want the Bill to go through, and another part is standing it off. There is a division of interest. One interest is very anxious it should go through, and the other interest is anxious it should not be passed. This is a kind of a compromise, to half-please both parties, and to get rid of a very vexatious clause referring to the Toronto and Niagara Power Company.

Mr. REID: I think every member in this House would like to see the Bill go through.

Mr. CARVELL: Minus the two clauses.

Mr. REID: There is a fight over there, and these amendments before us are very important to the railway employees, and for that reason we would like to be sure they are passed.

Mr. J. E. ARMSTRONG: I think I should answer the hon. member for Pictou (Mr. Macdonald). I am quite as anxious as he is that the Consolidated Railway Bill should become law, and while it is true the Bill has been brought in in the manner in which it has, I still have every confidence that the Senate will see their way clear to passing the Consolidated Railway Bill during this session. I cannot help but believe that they will see that the Bill is in the public interest, and should become law, and I am merely voicing the sentiments of every member in this House when I say we are all most anxious to see the Bill passed this session. I want to take this opportunity to thank the members of the committee on both sides for the non-partisan manner in which they conducted the proceedings of that committee. They worked very strenuously in connection with the legislation, and I would sincerely regret to see the Consolidated Railway Act defeated.

Mr. MACDONALD: I think the minister is very doubtful about it. I admire the optimism of the hon. member for East Lambton, but here we have a peculiar situation. If the Government, who control the majority in the Senate want the General Railway Act to go through, all they have to do is to crack the whip, as they did in the case of the Canadian Northern, the Franchise Bill and sundry other Acts, and the Bill would go through automatically. My hon. friend the leader of the House is an artist about these things, and he knows how to do it, if he would simply exert himself, but he is not exerting himself. He is not applying the same strategy in dealing with the matter as he did in the Canadian Northern Bill. My hon. friend from East Lambton does not realize the resourcefulness of the hon. minister. If he would put the proposition up to the Minister of Finance, and the other ministers, that this Railway Bill should go through the Senate, there would be no necessity for the passage of the Bill now before us. I really think he has not exerted that powerful influence which I am sure he could exert in relation to that important measure.

Bill reported as amended.

Amendments read the first and second time and concurred in.

On motion of Hon. Mr. Reid, the House adjourned at 11.55 p.m.

Wednesday, September 19, 1917.

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

QUESTIONS.

(Questions answered orally are indicated by asterisks.)

FRENCH-ENGLISH SIGNS AND FRENCH SIGNS ON POST OFFICES.

Mr. EDWARDS:

1. Under what Act of Parliament, Order in Council or other authority are French-English signs put up at a number of post offices outside of the province of Quebec?
2. Under what authority are purely French signs put up on the post offices at Verner, Ont., Edam, Sask., and other places outside Quebec province?

Mr. DOHERTY:

1. Under instructions of the late Postmaster General the Hon. Mr. Casgrain, that English signs only should be used in exclusively English communities, French signs only in exclusively French communities, and both French and English signs in mixed communities.

2. Answered by number one. In Edam instructions were that both French and English signs be used, and English and French signs were issued. As to Verner the inspector's report was that it was located in a purely French community.

MAXIMUM OR FIXED PRICE OF WHEAT.

*Mr. OLIVER:

1. Is $2.21 a bushel for No. 1 hard wheat a maximum or a fixed price to growers?
2. What commission is the elevator or commission agent allowed to charge?
3. Is commission charged to Canadian dealers the same as to export purchasers?
4. How many commission profits can be added from purchasers and consumer, or from miller to baker?

Sir GEORGE FOSTER: I may say, in answer to question No. 1, that the fixed price per bushel for No. 1 hard wheat is $2.21. The answer to No. 2 is that such commissions and fees as are allowable to elevators that come under the Act, and are usual in exchanges to members of exchanges, have not been interfered with. The answer to No. 3 is that Canadian dealers and export purchasers are on the same footing. It is impossible to answer No. 4, as it would all depend upon the transmigrations of the wheat from the Dominion following the seller until it reached the purchaser, but a farmer can cart his wheat to the loading platform, put it on the car, send it to Fort William, and pay no fees or commisions of any kind. If he uses the elevators he will pay the elevator fee, and if he uses middlemen, he will pay them their commission.

OFFICERS OF NAVAL SERVICE AT HALIFAX.

Mr. G. W. KYTE (Richmond) moved:

For a return giving the names, rank, pay, nature and date of employment and previous service of (a) all officers employed in or connected with the Naval Service at Halifax, including patrol service; (b) all civilians appointed since November, 1911. Also giving a list of the number, names and rate of pay of returned soldiers or sailors included in (a).

He said: I beg to amend this notice of motion, in accordance with the understanding arrived at with the Minister of Naval Affairs (Mr. Hazen), by striking out all the words after the word "service" in the fourth line. I wish to strike out the part of the question which asks for the names of the men and returned soldiers. My hon. friend the Minister of Naval Affairs spoke of the difficulty in obtaining the names, which would make a very large list.

Sir ROBERT BORDEN: Is the amendment in accordance with the understanding arrived at between my hon. friend and the Minister of Naval Affairs?

Mr. KYTE: That is my understanding, but if there should be any misunderstanding, I do not ask that the return be brought down. I merely wish to have the motion passed, so that if the minister or his officials find no objection to it the return may be brought down.

Sir ROBERT BORDEN: I will let the motion pass with that understanding, although I would prefer that the hon. gentleman should do as I suggested the other day, have given me the form in which he proposed to have the motion submitted.

Mr. KYTE: That is the form.

Sir ROBERT BORDEN: Yes, but I asked the hon. gentleman to give it to me so that I might submit it to the deputy minister, who would know much more about it than I do, and I would have come back with the information. But I am content to let it pass as amended.

Mr. KYTE: I entirely overlooked the matter. I intended communicating it to the Prime Minister, but it escaped my mind.

Motion as amended agreed to.

OFFICERS OF NAVAL SERVICE AT SYDNEY, N.S.

MOTION FOR RETURN.

Mr. KYTE moved:

For a return showing the names, rank, pay, nature, and date of employment and previous service of, (a) All officers employed in or connected with the Naval Service at Sydney, N.S., including patrol service; (b) The number, names and rate of pay of returned soldiers or sailors included in the above service.

He said: I desire to have this motion for return amended in the same way, by striking out all the words after the word "service" in the fourth line.

Motion agreed to.

DEPARTMENT OF THE INTERIOR.

APPROVAL OF CERTAIN ORDERS IN COUNCIL AS REQUIRED BY STATUTE.

Hon. W. J. ROCHE (Minister of the Interior) moved:

That the following Orders in Council, laid on the Table on the first day of February, 1917, be approved:

Orders in Council which have been published in the Canada Gazette, between 1st January, 1916, and the 31st December, 1916, in accordance with the provisions of section 77 of "The Dominion Lands Act," chapter 20, 7-8 Edward VII.

Orders in Council which have been published in the Canada Gazette, between the 1st January, 1916, and the 31st December, 1916, in accordance with the provisions of "The Forest Reserves and Park Act," section 19, of chapter 10, 1-2 George V.

Orders in Council which have been published in the Canada Gazette, between the 1st January, 1916, and the 31st December, 1916, in accordance with the provisions of sections 6, and 2, chapter 45, 3-4 George V, 1913, entitled "The Railway Belt Water Act."

Orders in Council which have been published in the Canada Gazette and in the British Columbia Gazette between 1st January, 1916, and the 31st December, 1916, in accordance with provisions of subsection (d) of section 38 of the regulations for the survey, administration, disposal and management of Dominion Lands within the 40-mile Railway Belt in the Province of British Columbia.

Sir WILFRID LAURIER: Will the hon. minister explain these Orders in Council to the House? We have forgotten what they were.

Mr. ROCHE: I am afraid that will take a long time. There are several dozens of them. The Orders in Council were laid upon the table of the House, in accordance with the provisions of the statute during the first fortnight of the session, and, as a rule, it is a formal matter to have Parliament approve of them.

If I were to enter into an explanation of every Order in Council passed, I am afraid that we should not have much time for any other work.

Sir WILFRID LAURIER: I have heard long discussions upon some of these Orders in Council in times past. I am quite prepared to believe that they are all right, but I should like to know what they refer to. For instance, the following Orders in Council are referred to in my hon. friend's motion:

Orders in Council which have been published in the Canada Gazette, between 1st January, 1916, and the 31st December, 1916, in accordance with the provisions of section 77 of "The Dominion Lands Act," chapter 20, 7-8 Edward VII.

I am sure that no member of the House except the minister himself knows what these Orders in Council are about. If my hon. friend will tell us in a general way what they are, we shall be satisfied.

Mr. ROCHE: I agree that unless members of the House had looked up the Orders in Council as they were laid upon the Table, they would not be acquainted with them. I shall give an explanation of some of them.

P.C. 3093. Order in Council, 6th January, 1916. This order applies to Dominion lands within the railway belt mainland, in the province of British Columbia. Provision has been made by previous orders of the 17th of October, 1914, and the 19th of June, 1915, for reckoning as residence spent on a homestead the time of an entrant on active military service, who made entry prior to enlistment, and for the issue of patent to such homesteader if disabled, or to his legal representative in the event of death.

This order provides that in case of an entry made after enlistment, or date of recall to the colours, that such entry may be protected during the continuance of military service, and for three months after discharge.

Similar provisions to the above have been passed under the authority of the Dominion Lands Act. The Dominion Lands Act does not apply to the railway belt in the province of British Columbia, which is governed by regulations passed by the Governor in Council, under authority of chapter 56, R.S.C.

P.C. 217. Order in Council, 4th February, 1916. This order applies to Dominion lands within the railway belt mainland, in the province of British Columbia. This order may be divided into two parts.

1. It extends to Dominion lands in the railway belt, British Columbia, the provisions of Order in Council of the 26th August, 1908, which provides that homestead entries taken up under the Dominion lands Act may be made by proxy.

2. It provides that proxy entries made for Dominion lands in the railway belt, by any person serving with the forces of Great Britain or any of her Allies, is to have the same standing as if it had been made in person.

Sir WILFRID LAURIER: What about the Orders in Council with respect to the Forest Reserves and Park Act?

Mr. ROCHE: This Order in Council covers a number of amendments in the details of the forest reserve regulations which were found to be necessary after they had been in operation for a little over two years. The amendments make better provision for dealing with fire, provide for making more clear certain portions of the provisions of the regulations in regard to timber permits, for extending for not more than one year the time of a timber sale where it is considered in the public interest, to make clearer some of the provisions in regard to grazing, and to provide specially for cases where cattle graze for part of a season on the forest reserve and for the remainder of the season on lands outside, for slight amendments to the hay permit regulations so as to prevent confusion with the regulations on Dominion lands outside of the forest reserves, and for extending the right to a permit for a period not to exceed five

years where improvement of the meadow is made by the permittee by drainage or otherwise; for altering the regulations in regard to fishing so as to make them more fully in agreement with the general fishery regulations.

Some regulations are also made by Order in Council in regard to Dominion lands adjacent to waterfalls on the Winnipeg river. Some time ago we changed the Dominion Lands Act so that in the future lands adjacent to water-powers should be leased, not sold. This Order in Council refers to mines and minerals under such lands adjacent to water-powers.

Motion agreed to.

EXEMPTIONS UNDER MILITARY SERVICE ACT.

On the Orders of the Day:

Mr. ERNEST LAPOINTE (Kamouraska): I wish to call the attention of the Government to the following letter which has been circulated in connection with the Military Service Act. The letter is in French; I shall read the English translation:

(Translation.)

Ottawa, September 11th, 1917.

Dear sir:—

I have the pleasure to inform you that the regulations made under the Military Law exempt the farmers, their families and industrials in good faith.

I have at last succeeded to win my point, and it is only justice.

You can without any fear, whatever, present your unmarried sons to the Tribunals. Instructions are given according to what I now tell you.

I hope the farmers will do their utmost for the largest production of all that is necessary to feed the populations.

With my best wishes, believe me,

Yours truly,

J. H. Rainville.

This letter has been sent by the Deputy Speaker of the House to a large number of farmers in Quebec province, especially in the county of Chambly-Vercheres. I wish to know from the Government whether the statements contained in this letter are true, whether regulations have been made along the line indicated therein and whether the Deputy Speaker of the House has been authorized to make known these regulations before they have been communicated to Parliament.

Sir ROBERT BORDEN: I did not follow very carefully the reading of the letter as my hon. friend gave it. My impression is that the regulations have not yet been fully completed. Doubtless the hon. gentleman who wrote the letter is giving his impression of what the regulations may be. However, I shall look at the letter as it appears in Hansard and, if necessary, speak again on the subject.

Sir WILFRID LAURIER: Is it the intention of the Government to pass regulations exempting any particular classes of British subjects from military service?

Sir ROBERT BORDEN: The proposed regulations will come to us from the Military Service Council, with the approval of the Central Appeal Judge. They have not yet been presented to the Government; therefore I do not know whether any such regulation as my right hon. friend suggests is to be submitted to us.

QUEBEC ELECTORAL LISTS.

On the Orders of the Day:

Mr. L. A. LAPOINTE (Montreal, St. James): I desire to ask the Secretary of State (Hon. Arthur Meighen) if it is the intention of the Government to have electoral lists printed according to law? I quote section 15 of the Dominion Elections Act:

It shall be the duty of the Clerk of the Crown in Chancery, immediately upon receipt by him of any such certified copy of a list of voters, to cause it to be printed by the King's Printer, and he shall thereafter retain such certified copy of record in his office.

The electoral list for the city of Montreal, which was revised in January, has been sent by the registrar of the city of Montreal to the clerk of the Crown in Chancery. The list, which is to be the basis of the list that would be used according to the new Act is in force and should have been printed—

Mr. SPEAKER: Order.

Mr. L. A. LAPOINTE: I will explain.

Mr. SPEAKER: Order. The hon. member is not in order in proceeding to make any argument. If he chooses to ask a question, that is permissible. I feel like allowing more latitude now, because there is a possibility that this session may terminate some day; otherwise I would insist upon this and similar questions going on the Order Paper.

Mr. L. A. LAPOINTE: I want to make my point very clear. In view of section 16 which says:

Immediately after printing such list, the King's Printer shall send by registered mail twenty copies thereof to the sitting member for

the electoral district to which the list belongs, and twenty copies to the defeated candidate at the last Dominion election therein.

Is the Government going to provide—

Mr. SPEAKER: Order. The hon. member can put a simple question which will embrace the whole matter——

Mr. L. A. LAPOINTE: I am going to ask a question.

Mr. SPEAKER: The hon. member can ask: Does the Government intend to follow the provisions of the electoral law?

Mr. L. A. LAPOINTE: I said I wanted to emphasize my question. There are different ways in which one can——

Mr. SPEAKER: Order. Unless the hon. member puts his question, I shall ask him to resume his seat.

Mr. L. A. LAPOINTE: Is it the intention of the Government to send out to the candidate, or to the defeated candidate, or to the members for the different constituencies of the city of Montreal the list which they have a right to be put in possession of according to the law? That is my question.

Hon. ARTHUR MEIGHEN (Secretary of State): I need scarcely say that, whatever the law is, it will be fully complied with, but the hon. member should observe that the section which he read, and which he stated to be section 16 of the Act, is included in part I of the Act, and, under the War-time Elections Act, part I is suspended for this election. Consequently what he reads is not the law in so far as it appertains to the coming election. The lists, however, for the province of Quebec are to be used subject to well defined modifications and the lists for that province, that is the provincial lists, I understand, can be obtained, from the custodians on payment of a small fee. Those, however, are not the lists that will be used in the Dominion election. The modifications referred to have first to take place, but the War-time Elections Act provides that the list finally to be used shall be supplied to the different candidates at the dates mentioned in the Elections Act, both when completed by the enumerators and when revised.

Mr. L. A. LAPOINTE: Another question. I want to find out from the Secretary of State if the War-time Elections Act has any retroactive effect.

Mr. MEIGHEN: No; it has no retroactive effect.

Mr. L. A. LAPOINTE: Then we have a right to have our lists.

Mr. SPEAKER: Order.

COUNTY COURT JUDGE, DISTRICT NO. 6, NOVA SCOTIA.

On the Orders of the Day:

Mr. J. H. SINCLAIR (Guysborough): Has any decision been reached by the Government regarding the appointment of a county court judge for district No. 6, Nova Scotia?

Sir ROBERT BORDEN: The recommendation was sent to His Excellency some days ago. I presume it has been approved, but I am not quite sure. The Minister of Justice does not happen to be in his place at present. I am now informed that the recommendation has been approved. The gentleman recommended for the appointment is Mr. Daniel McNeil, K.C., of Inverness.

EXHIBITION OF WAR TROPHIES.

On the Orders of the Day:

Sir ROBERT BORDEN: May I be permitted to draw the attention of members of the House to the extensive collection of trophies of the war which have been presented to the Government of Canada by the President of the French Republic and by the Prime Minister of the United Kingdom? It might be noted that the collection of trophies includes other smaller articles which have been in part acquired as gifts from individuals and in part acquired at trifling outlay. Part of this collection was exhibited last week in Ottawa for the benefit of the Canadian Red Cross Society and was visited by considerably over 20,000 persons. I have made arrangements that this exhibition, which is in Lansdowne park, shall be open to the members of this House and of the Senate during the remainder of the week, and I hope many of them will take advantage of the opportunity of seeing those interesting objects. I took occasion the other morning myself to go very early and spend fifteen or twenty minutes in looking at this collection, and I was very amply repaid and should have liked to be able to devote a much longer time to the purpose.

The collection includes an armed biplane which has been in service in France and which, I believe, has been twenty or thirty times across the German lines; two of the famous "seventy-five" French field guns; a large gun captured at Vimy Ridge. That gun is very interesting because it bears on

it the obvious marks of a direct hit during that action. The collection also includes several types of machine guns, trench mortars, anti-aircraft guns, a complete range of shells and thousands of other objects. I should not omit to allude to the collection of posters, proclamations and prints of all the belligerent nations, I think, which illustrate the appeals made to the people of the several nations of the Allies and enemy nations as well. One very interesting poster, which is to be found amongst those on exhibition is an original poster announcing the condemnation and death of Edith Cavell.

I should fail in my duty if I did not, on this occasion, express the very warm appreciation of the people of Canada and their Government for the generosity of the French republic in donating those articles to Canada, and in assuming the heavy charges incidental to conveying them to this country. It should be added that only a portion of the collection has yet reached Canada. The larger trophies from the British naval and military authorities have not yet arrived, but I am sure hon. gentlemen will find the collection most instructive, and I hope that arrangements may be made so that those trophies can be seen by the people of all parts of the Dominion.

WAGES OF EMPLOYEES OF RAILWAY COMPANIES.

RAILWAY ACT AMENDMENT—THIRD READING.

Sir ROBERT BORDEN moved:

That the House do now proceed to Public Bills and Orders for the purpose of taking up Order No. 21, Third Reading of Bill No. 103.

Motion agreed to.

Sir ROBERT BORDEN moved:

That Bill No. 103, concerning the payment of salaries or wages of employees of railway companies be read the third time.

He said: I have still strong hope that the Railway Bill, as passed by the House of Commons, will be passed by the Senate, although as I explained yesterday, some of the clauses are found to be very controversial there, and, in consequence, a great deal of delay has been entailed. I think it is desirable that this Bill should be read the third time and sent to the Senate with the amendments which were passed last evening. If the Senate should pass the Railway Bill, they need not concur in this Bill, because all those amendments are covered by the Railway Bill as it passed the House of Commons.

[Sir Robert Borden.]

If, on the other hand, the Senate should fail to pass the Railway Bill, then I have strong hope that it will accept this Bill with the amendments which we have added to it, so that the provisions which are properly regarded as very important by the railway employees in this country may be brought into force.

Mr. GRAHAM: Last night the Minister of Customs, who was leading the House, told us that if we reported this Bill it could stand for third reading until we ascertained if the Railway Bill was going through the Senate. If the Railway Bill is going through the Senate, there is no reason why we should give this Bill a third reading. If the Senate would just leave the Franchise Act where it is, and devote their attention to the Railway Bill, we might get that measure through.

Motion agreed to, Bill read the third time, and passed.

SUPPLY.

The House in Committee of Supply, Mr. D. Stewart in the Chair.

Pensions payable to militiamen, and on active service, as follows: Northwest Rebellion, 1885, $14,000; general, $30,000—$44,000.

Mr. REID: I have received from Mr. J. W. Borden, Paymaster-General, the following memorandum on this item, which stood for explanation:

Ottawa, 18th September, 1917.

The Honourable J. D. Reid,
Minister of Customs,
Ottawa, Ont.

Dear Sir:—

I am advised by Mr. Forsythe, Clerk of Estimates, that you require information in regard to an amount of $44,000 that was placed in the Main Estimates of 1917-18, to cover pensions payable to the militia men on active service, Northwest Rebellion, 1885, $14,000, and general, $30,000.

This may be explained by reference to pages P90 and P91 of the Auditor General's Report for the year 1915-16, from which it will be seen for that year pensions for the Northwest Rebellion, 1885, were $13,581, and for militia pensions generally, $7,582.

The increased amount for the latter class of pensioners was estimated on account of the large number of militia men, who were on guard in Canada, and whose pensions would be payable out of this appropriation. There was no way to clearly estimate the amount, and it was thought that $30,000 would cover any possible pensions which might become payable.

Yours truly,

J. W. Borden,
A/A. & P.M.G.

Mr. OLIVER: I did not know that there were pensions payable in respect of the Northwest Rebellion except for disability.

Mr. REID: Our Pensions Act has reference only to soldiers who have enlisted for service overseas. There are men who have been wounded or injured on home guard duty, and any pensions that are granted to these men appear in this item, and not under the regular pensions vote.

Mr. OLIVER: I do not understand it at all. One part of the minister's explanation was that pensions to men who had served in the Northwest Rebellion and had suffered physical disability, not being covered by the regular pensions vote, required a special vote. That I can easily understand. But I do not recall that the amount of pensions in respect of physical disabilities incurred in connection with the Northwest Rebellion is nearly so large an amount as this in the item. I do not understand my hon. friend's reference to pensions payable because of home guard service. I do not object to the payment of pensions that we owe, but I should like to know what we are paying these pensions for.

Mr. REID: There are two big pension items still to be discussed, and perhaps we could put this item through, and allow discussion on it to take place on either of the two other items, when the officials of the department will be here.

Mr. MACDONALD: I agree with the hon. member for Edmonton that the House ought to know upon what terms these pensions are being paid. The essential basis of a claim to a pension in connection with the Northwest Rebellion or any other service is that physical disability should have been incurred. The minister speaks of a pension arrangement for the encouragement of men who have not volunteered for overseas service in the present war, but have been employed on home service. The minister ought to tell us under what regulations these pensions are being paid. We have a Pensions Board, constituted after careful consideration by a committee of the House, which drafted the conditions, which were afterwards promulgated by an Order in Council, under which men who had gone overseas were entitled to a pension. If there is an Order in Council providing for the payment of pensions for home service, the House ought to know about it. I have not heard of it before.

Mr. REID: As I understand it, men on home service are paid under the Militia Act.

Mr. MACDONALD: Under the Militia Act?

Mr. REID: Under the Militia Act. This $20,000 was increased on account of so many more pensions that would be necessary because of the home guard. That was the explanation, as I supposed, but, as I stated a minute ago, we will probably be an hour or so on these pensions, and I will take the matter up with the officials, and be in a position to give full information in regard to it before we leave the subject.

Mr. MACDONALD: I would like the minister to obtain from his officials a list of those who are now receiving pensions in connection with the Northwest Rebellion, and also a copy of the conditions under which those pensions are paid. I would also like to get a statement of those who are receiving pensions on account of disabilities sustained in home service. I see no reason why there should be any such large amount as $30,000 provided for pensions for men who are on home service, because they are not engaged in any enterprise involving danger to life and limb. Any disability they might sustain would probably be the result of accident. I think we should have some further information on the subject.

Mr. REID: I do not agree with the hon. member for Pictou that pensions should not be paid to those on home service.

Mr. MACDONALD: I did not say that. I would simply like to know the conditions under which the minister is undertaking to pay them. I fancy there may be conditions under which a man might get a pension, and I think those conditions should be before us so that the House and the country may know what they are. A man engaged in home service is not engaged in an enterprise that would endanger life or limb. It seems to me any pension granted to him would be as compensation, more or less, for accidental injury.

Mr. REID: That is right. I will have the information for my hon. friend very shortly.

Pensions—European War, $8,000,000.

Mr. PROULX: At the beginning of the session the Prime Minister told us that a Pensions Bill would be introduced. Has the Government abandoned its intention of doing this?

Mr. REID: Yes. We are not going to pass a Pensions Act this session. The Pen-

sions Act will remain over until the meeting of the new Parliament.

Mr. PROULX: Will the regulations be changed or enlarged? There are certain regulations now governing the Board of Pensions Commissioners, and there are cases which are not met by those regulations. I had an instance of this in my constituency last summer, the case of a foster-parent. I brought the matter to the attention of the Prime Minister early in the session, and he said a Pensions Bill would be brought down, and that it would go before a special committee, and that I might lay the case before that committee. Does the minister know whether it is the intention of the Government to change the regulations?

Mr. REID: The regulations have been enforced by the Pensions Board up to the present time. I could not say whether it would become necessary to change them between now and the meeting of the next Parliament. They will not be changed unless there are some cases which really must be disposed of. No doubt cases will arise, such as the hon. member for Prescott (Mr. Proulx) has stated, that cannot be dealt with by the Pensions Board. The present Pensions Board has full charge of the enforcement of the pension regulations, which regulations were prepared in accordance with the recommendations of the Joint Committee of the House last session. If there are cases which require the amending of the regulations, and such change is recommended by the Board of Commissioners, of course the matter would be given every consideration.

Mr. NESBITT: If I remember correctly, the Prime Minister stated a short time ago that he would not amend the Pensions Bill this year, but that the Government would pass an Order in Council increasing the pensions on a percentage basis. Will the minister tell us what the percentage was, and has the Order in Council been passed?

Mr. REID: The Order in Council has not been passed as yet.

Mr. OLIVER: I have received a communication from an association at Edmonton, comprised of responsible citizens, whose purpose is to give special attention to the requirements of the families of soldiers on service, or the needs of those who have rendered service and have returned. This statement has been forwarded to me by the Hon. Mr. Rutherford, who is Director of National Service for Northern Alberta. I have already brought to the attention of the House certain recommendations of this body of citizens, and submitted them for the consideration of the Minister of Militia, who promised to give his best attention to these recommendations. The memorandum which I then placed before the House was in the nature of a general statement, and it is now the desire of the committee to support that statment by mentioning a number of cases, and by giving some more specific information. I would like to read what the committee says in regard to one class of cases, referring to instances where the pension is insufficient at the present time, considering the high cost of living. They say:

> It is useless to specify in this class when one considers that the average family budget as shown by the report of the Department of Labour for food, rent, fuel and lighting is over $12 per month and steadily rising. It is readily seen that the present pension rates are inadequate except where the widow is young and strong and without children, then she can supplement the pension, but where there are children or where the widow is not in robust health, the $32 per month is manifestly inadequate. One case that has come particularly before the committee is that of Mrs. Elizabeth Daynes. This widow has had to sell certain articles of her household furniture to buy the food and medicines necessary for herself and young child, to make it possible for her to live while in receipt of $38 per month as pension. These facts may be verified by affidavit, if necessary.

I think it is desirable to place before the committee the representations made by this body of responsible citizens in regard to the present scale of pensions. The case I have just cited relates to the support of the family of a deceased soldier. I would urge that the Government take proper steps that the pension rate shall be increased, having regard to the increased cost of living.

When the pension scale was recommended by the committee of last year the scale was recognized as the minimum. There were differences of opinion between members of the committee as to the amount, and while all the members of the committee agreed finally to the presentation of the report, it was not because there were not varying views held. Of course, it was necessary that the committee should agree. I think I am perfectly justified in saying that this recommendation was the minimum recommendation. Taking into consideration that the pension scale is a minimum recommendation and that the cost of living has increased since that time, I would urge that in due course a reasonable increase be made in the pension scale.

Mr. REID: I agree that everything should be done that can be done for those who have served at the front or who have been injured or whose families have suffered from their being at the front. It was with that object in view that the joint committee took the question up last session. They came to certain conclusions which have been adopted and put in force. The pension list is going to be a very large item. It is increasing by leaps and bounds as the war proceeds and if this war is to last a long time the pension list will be very large. But the question is an important one and it should receive the fair consideration of this House. The conclusion which has been arrived at is that the matter should be left over until next session for final decision. In the meantime the Government will take the matter up and do what they think is right to put it in proper shape; and it will carry on the work until the House meets again. Not having had time to prepare a proper pension Bill or to go into the question this session, we are just asking for a vote such as we have put in the estimates in order to pay the pensions that it is now necessary to pay from day to day.

Mr. PARDEE: There is a matter to which I wish to direct the attention of the Government and that is the system of paying sums of $100 or less to men injured and who are classed as under twenty per cent fit. Several cases have come to my notice in which this system has worked the very greatest hardship. Perhaps being under twenty per cent fit is not always a real disability but there are cases where men who have been adjudged under twenty per cent who are possibly not able to do a day's work and who will not be for a long time to come. A case was brought to my attention last week in which a man was adjudged to be under twenty per cent fit; he received $75 and that is all he will get. The man is practically disabled; he will never be capable of doing a day's work again. That is one of the provisions of the Act that needs amending.

My own opinion is that any man who comes back here and who is found twenty per cent unfit, but permanently injured, and who is not as good a man as he was when he left, should not be given a maximum payment of $100, but he should be awarded a pension by the State. I believe there are some hon. gentlemen on the other side of the House who agree with me. Any man who has served, and who comes back less fit than he was when he went away, is entitled to be taken care of by the State so long as he lives if he requires that care. It is a simple matter of justice and humanity on our part. I would like to present that view to the Government as strongly as I can.

I would also like to ask the Government whether or not there is any intention to adopt an insurance scheme in connection with the pension system. I understand in the United States they have a method of insurance which is carried on by a deduction from the allowance of the pensioner of a certain amount per month, the Government paying the difference between the amount deducted and the amount necessary to carry the premium. That was somewhat discussed when we had the commission of inquiry in the hospitals matter. No agreement or decision was arrived at because we did not seem to have the necessary information to enable us to become fully seized of all the aspects of the matter. It would appear to me to be a very reasonable thing to do, and I hope that between now and the next session of Parliament the Government will take the matter up and see if some such scheme can be devised so that the men and their dependents will feel that they will be taken care of and that later on the families of soldiers will receive an amount increased to the extent of the insurance. It would give the returned soldier a comfortable feeling to know that, while a certain small amount was taken from his pension and the balance of the premium was made up by the State, his dependents would later on reap the benefit.

4 p.m.

Sir GEORGE FOSTER: There is before the United States Congress at the present time a Bill, or Bills, dealing with the matter. The legislation which comes out of Congress will afford very valuable information for the consideration of the Government between now and the time of meeting of the next Parliament. I have every sympathy with this system of insurance as one method at least by which that proper provision can be made for our soldiers who have gone overseas and that may be taken as one element or factor. I do not know whether there has been any extensive system of insurance adopted by any other country, but that matter will be looked into.

Mr. CURRIE: As one interested in soldiers, I have made it my business to follow up cases where complaints were made in reference to pensions. With reference to the subject that was brought up about a man serving at home, I know of one case in which a man whilst training for the expeditionary force contracted appendicitis. He was operated on and died. His wife and children should and are receiving a pension. I think the appropriation referred to in the first item called would be to provide pensions for cases of this kind. I know another case where a very strong healthy young soldier was on a march in Canada, and slipped on a stone in the road, sustaining injuries with the result that his foot had to be amputated just above the ankle. Cases of that kind occur constantly. The Pension Board's policy as far as I can see, is one for which I have nothing but commendation. We should look at the matter in a purely non-partisan manner. I know many cases which have been dealt with promptly. Colonel Labatt served at the front as an officer, and his sympathies are entirely with the wounded returned soldier. Considering the tremendous amount of work he has undertaken in organizing that department, and considering the great numbers of cases which have come before him, the work the board has done has been marvellous. If a case is a clear one, and a pension is required, there is no delay whatever. In some cases, questions may arise as to whether pensions should be granted or not on the amount. At first there was great difficulty in getting these matters threshed out, but now the Pension Board has officers in various localities, and if complaint is made at the Pension Board that the pensions are necessary or inadequate, or anything of that kind, an officer is immediately sent to investigate the matter, and if any irregularities are found relief is immediately given. It may take a long time to adjudicate upon some cases. The hon. member for Prescott referred to certain cases, but as far as the Pensions Department is concerned, it is certainly not their fault if those who are suffering disability do not receive their pensions promptly. The hon. member for West Lambton has referred to cases where men are dismissed with small gratuity if their disability is under 20 per cent. I know of several cases where men were discharged without even pensions, and it subsequently developed that they were suffering from gas when they arrived here and when they were discharged. To my knowledge, a number of these soldiers subsequently developed tuberculosis as a result of gas, and every one of these soldiers, after reference had been made to the Pensions Board, was returned to service and pay, treated in military hospitals as if he had never been discharged, sent to Gravenhurst or other places to recover, and pension was granted. In addition to that, some of them died, and provision has been made for their widows and children, in spite of the fact that they were discharged and considered at one time to have no claim on the Government. I give these instances to show the sympathetic manner in which the Pensions Board deals with these matters.

With reference to the increasing of the pensions on account of the high cost of living, in numbers of cases it is difficult for the parties to get along with the pensions allowed them, and in each case where the pension was not sufficient if application was made by the men to the Government, the man or the woman, as the case may be, is provided with some form of employment, which supplements the pension, so that they need not want for daily bread. Whether it is wise to increase the pensions to a greater amount than at present allowed is a question. I quite agree that, if conditions remain as at present, it will be necessary to increase the pensions considerably. I think I am quite safe in saying that, because I know many cases where children and widows have not received sufficient pension to permit them to live in a respectable manner, but we must also remember that it is possible that some change may come over the scene, and, instead of food and living soaring to the top as it is now, prices may drop, in a few years, and the cost of living may be greatly reduced. So far as the administration of the Pensions Board is concerned, I do not think a single case has been brought before them, to my knowledge, in which they did not grant prompt relief. I can speak in the highest terms of the efficiency of that board, and I do so gladly because the officer who is the active member of the board is an old comrade-in-arms of mine, and I know his heart is right in regard to looking after the returned soldiers. There has not been one single case that I have brought to his attention that he has not dealt with promptly and justly. Numbers of cases have been called to my attention from all over the country, because a number of the soldiers seem to think they should send a letter to me, if they have a complaint, and the attention of the board has been promptly given, and justice done. In many cases

justice has been done where possibly, if they had not looked upon the case in a sympathetic manner, they would not have granted any pension. The conditions which now obtain are giving great satisfaction to the returned soldier, and the number of complaints made in recent months has been greatly reduced. There is a certain class of soldier who did not serve at all, but malingered, who claims a pension. I refer to those who suffer from imaginary rheumatism, and that sort of thing in England. I find, as a rule, some of these are inclined to be chronic grumblers. Fully 98 per cent of the men in receipt of pensions are men of established character and first-class men in every shape and form. There are always one or two in a thousand who give the public the impression that they do not deserve anything, and I trust the public will deal kindly with their cases, and not take their complaints seriously, realizing that the Pensions Board is doing everything possible to ameliorate the suffering of the wounded and sick soldier, looking after the widow, and seeing that the orphan is brought up by the state as it should be.

Mr. OLIVER: I am sorry that on this occasion I find it impossible to altogether agree with what my hon. friend has said. I notice in the newspaper to-day an item stating that the Ottawa Great War Veterans' Association had a meeting last evening and discussed the action of the Government in granting gratuities in lieu of pensions to returned soldiers. The matter was thoroughly discussed, and the action of the Government unanimously condemned. My opinion is entirely in line with the view expressed by the hon. member for West Lambton, namely, that in many cases trifling gratuities have been granted where men have suffered a serious permanent disability. That is an abuse of the power of the Pensions Board. It is not the fault of the pensions scale, nor of the Pensions Committee of last session, nor is it the fault of the Government that framed the Order in Council passed on the recommendation of that committee. It is the administration of the Pensions Board that is at fault. When they disregard the fact that a man is suffering from a disability that permanently decreases his earning power, and give him a gratuity of $25, or $75, or $100 and turn him loose, they are not treating him fairly, or, as the country desires he should be treated. I know of a man who received a permanent injury to one of his legs, so that he walks through life with a serious limp, and he was given a gratuity of $25.

I know many other cases in which men have suffered disability which did not entirely incapacitate them, but which seriously reduced their earning power or interfered with their possibilities in life. Yet the Pensions Board dealt with these men simply by the payment of a small gratuity. I do not consider that that is in line with the spirit of the country; I do not think it is in line with the intention of the Government. I know that it is not in line with the views of the committee that had to do with the drafting of the scale of pensions.

Mr. REID: The regulations concerning pensions were made in accordance with the recommendations of a committee of this House. The Board of Pension Commissioners have forms to be filled in by persons disabled. Upon these forms, which may be filled in by a clergyman or a doctor, a certificate is made as to the condition of the man, whether he has any other visible means of support, and so on. Upon this report the Board of Pension Commissioners act. In a case that occurred in my county, the person who filled in the blanks stated that the man in question had other means of support, and on that report the Board of Pension Commissioners could not do otherwise than act as they did. If representations are made to the Board, however, that full justice has not been done in any given case, the board will take the matter up again, reconsider it, and see that justice is done. Pension and gratuity claims are coming in in large numbers, and they must be dealt with according to the best evidence available in order that settlement may be arrived at as soon as possible. Every case is subject to revision by the Pensions Board; the facts may be re-examined and the conditions again looked into. The Board have special officers to deal with such cases. If any member of the House or, indeed, any person outside of the House hears of a case where injustice was done, I am satisfied that the Board of Pension Commissioners, upon the matter being brought to their attention, will take steps to see that justice is done. There may be cases where persons would be probably ignorant of the law or, for other reasons, would not be able to take up their own cases; it is only fair and right that we should interest ourselves in such matters.

Members of the House and private citizens generally should take every step to see that justice is done to those who are entitled to consideration under this Act. I desire only to emphasize my impression that the Pensions Board are anxious to see that justice is done to all; I know that justice will be done if all these matters are brought to their attention.

Mr. MORPHY: The difficulty as I see it is that we are not now discussing principles that should govern. I should like to have an expression from the Government on the point whether men who have sustained 20 per cent disability as a result of the war and who have been paid $25, $50, $75 or $100, are absolutely shut out from any further claim. The estimate that a man has 20 per cent disability to-day may be quite correct, but the seeds of weakness in his constitution may at no distant date grow into a 40 per cent disability. It is unfortunate if a man who is in need of money, taking advantage of what he understands to be the law, should submit himself to an examination, receive $50 or $75, and be absolutely shut out from any further claim in the future. The minister speaks very nicely, but I think that there should be something more than the nice words. I believe that public opinion will not stand for injustice to any returned soldier through settlement being made upon a basis of 20 per cent disability, if the seeds of weakness in his constitution afterwards cause him to sustain a 50 per cent disability.

Mr. CURRIE: I did not say that.

Mr. MORPHY: I am not referring to the member for North Simcoe, or to any other gentleman in that regard. Some member of the Government should announce the principle that these men may come back and that their cases will be given further consideration if necessary. Even doctors may not know whether the 20 per cent arrived at as a result of examination is the real extent of the disability from which a man is suffering. Certainly the man himself does not know, and it would be a great act of improvidence to make a settlement upon a basis of 20 per cent and shut the man out from further consideration. Many soldiers who return are not normal; in many cases their judgment is not as strong as it was before the war. Moreover, we must guard the soldier against his own improvidence, if necessary; we must not, simply in order to expedite settlement, take advantage of a man who is not in normal condition. When a man is injured in a railway accident, the settlement claims agent calls upon him as quickly as possible after the wreck or the accident; the injured man accepts $100, $200, $300, as the case may be. Some have avoided this speedy settlement and subsequently obtained thousands of dollars through a verdict against the company. There must be absolute frankness, absolute openness; there must be tender care on our part to guard against improvidence and to do what this country ought to do for men who have offered themselves as sacrifices in the interests of their country.

Mr. MIDDLEBRO: The complaint of the member for Edmonton (Mr. Oliver) was, perhaps, justified in the first part of the administration of the pensions. I believe that under the former rule, and according to the recommendation of the general Committee on Pensions, if a man's disability did not exceed 20 per cent he could be paid off in a lump sum by way of gratuity.

When the matter came before the Returned Soldiers' Committee, the committee was almost unanimously of opinion that the grading should be in tenths and not in fifths, for this reason: You might have a man who was injured nineteen per cent of the extent of total disability, and he would be paid off with a gratuity of perhaps $100. If he was injured one per cent more, however, he would be paid $8 a month for the balance of his life. In my opinion there is too much of a discrepancy between those two disabilities, and if the grading has not been made in tenths, I strongly urge that the grades of disability should be divided into tenths instead of into fifths. There is no reason why a man who is injured to the extent of 19 per cent should be paid off with a lump sum of $100, whereas a man who is disabled to the extent of 20 per cent should receive $8 a month for the rest of his life.

It is said that a man who is not totally incapacitated on account of deafness cannot be given a pension; that he comes under the 20 per cent class. That is to say, he might be deaf to the extent of nine-tenths in both ears, and he would still be under the twenty per cent class and would not be entitled to a permanent pension, but would be given a gratuity. There is no justice in that. If a man is incapacitated to the extent of nine-tenths of his total hearing capacity, he would be useless for many occupations in life.

Mr. OLIVER: I have had many instances of that.

Mr. MIDDLEBRO: He might be useless for the occupation in which he was formerly engaged. Therefore, there should be more provision for a soldier incapacitated to that extent.

There is another question to which I wish to refer, which, while it does not directly affect the question of pensions, affects the total amount that we shall have to pay. I refer to the medical examination in the first instance. The medical examiners in the first instance were, in many cases, not as strict as they should be. At the beginning of the war large numbers were anxious to enlist, and we were all anxious to see them go. But when we are going to raise another 100,000 men, the medical examiners should be men of the highest calibre and of the greatest experience, and they should be appointed permanently. The system of one week appointing a medical board composed of certain men and another week a medical board composed of certain other men who do not get the experience of the first board for the short time they have been working, is a very bad system, and will entail a responsibility for millions of dollars on this country. I would, therefore, suggest that the men who are appointed for the purpose of examining the 100,000 men who are shortly to be enlisted, should be men of the greatest experience. It costs something like $1,500 to equip a man, train him, send him overseas and get him ready to go into the trenches. If we pay $1,500 for a medically unfit man who is worse than useless when he goes into the trenches, we are doing an injustice to the country by taking him in the first instance. The men who are enlisted should be men of the highest possible efficiency. In addition to a medically unfit man being worse than useless when he goes into the trenches, when he comes back to Canada, he has a fair claim to a pension from this country, because he has been passed as medically fit. In such a case, how can you conscientiously get over his claim that he offered himself; that he was passed by the medical officers provided by the Government who in effect, said to him: You are a fit man? That being the case, he has a prima facie case for a pension. I cannot urge too strongly upon this House that the medical examiners for those 100,000 men should be thoroughly experienced and efficient.

Mr. NICKLE: There is a certain misapprehension existing in the minds of hon. members of the committee as to just what the claims for pensions are. With the hon. member for Edmonton (Mr. Oliver) I was a member with others of the Pensions Committee of last year, and I am not so carried away with enthusiasm for the work of that committee that I am prepared to say that it was perfect. A good beginning was made, but it is capable of much improvement, and I think, when the next session of Parliament is convened, very radical improvements will be made, if a committee of this House gives the matter further attention. I thoroughly agree with my hon. friend (Mr. Middlebro) that the committee of last year made a mistake in dividing the pensions only into six classes: five classes and a gratuity. The Great War Veterans' Association, and the experience of last year has taught those who have given any consideration to the subject that we should have at least eleven classes; ten classes and a gratuity and that it is very unfair to the man who suffers a disability of 19 per cent, that he should be paid off with a gratuity not exceeding $100, whereas a man who has a disability of 21 per cent—I am using arbitrary figures to illustrate my argument—should receive a pension of $8 a month or $96 a year. It is well understood and recognized that it is right that we should have at least ten classes. I think it also can be said that it is recognized that no man should be compelled to accept a gratuity unless he chooses to do so. If a man has suffered disability and desires recognition on the part of the State for the sacrifice he has made for his country, he should have an opportunity of taking either a pension or a gratuity. If he wants to take a gratuity, he should have a right to take it, but if he prefers to take a pension, then he should have the right to do so.

In regard to the point raised by the hon. member for North Perth (Mr. Morphy), if he will be good enough to turn to paragraph 8 of the committee's report of last year, he will see it is distinctly stated in that paragraph that a man is not estopped by the taking of any gratuity or pension at the time the award is made. Paragraph 8 says:

> Each case shall be subject to review at the end of a year from the time the pension is first granted, except in those cases where the disability is obviously permanent, and then there can be no further review.

In the working out of that provision, it was found that many men had been improperly or prematurely discharged; that there had not been a keen appreciation of the disability the men had suffered. As a result, an Order in Council was passed by which it was provided that, if any man

could show that he had been improperly or prematurely discharged, he was entitled again to be admitted to hospital and have his case medically treated, and then when the time came for his again being discharged his right to a pension was considered as if he had never before been before a court of review. That means that if a man, at any time within a year, reaches the conclusion that he has not received adequate consideration, he has a right to apply to the board for special consideration, and if fresh complications have set in, and if he can show that those complications are the result of service, he can go back to hospital and have his case reviewed.

Mr. MIDDLEBRO: Is the 20 per cent class retroactive?

Mr. NICKLE: No.

Mr. MIDDLEBRO. Will it be retroactive?

Mr. NICKLE: I can hardly answer the question of the hon. member, because I do not know what the policy of the next Parliament will be. It will be within its jurisdiction to say whether or not the new Act shall be retroactive. Answering the question my hon. friend has raised in regard to deafness, the gentleman who brought that matter to his attention must have laboured under a misapprehension, because I see by referring to paragraph 12, class 4, which determines what certain disabilities are, it is provided that total deafness shall be considered a disability of 40 per cent. Total deafness of one ear entitles a man to a gratuity. If a man were totally deaf in one ear and were substantially affected in another, he would come out of the gratuity class and go into class four.

Mr. MIDDLEBRO: If a man is nine-tenths deaf in both ears, that is partial deafness in both ears, and he comes under the 20 per cent class.

Mr. NICKLE: If a man is almost totally deaf in both ears he would certainly go in class 5, because provision is made that if totally deaf in both ears he shall go in class 4, and class 6 includes those totally deaf in one ear only. It would only be in a case of trivial deafness that a man would go in the gratuity class.

Mr. MIDDLEBRO: I put this question distinctly to the officers who appeared before the Soldier's Aid Commission, and they said that under the wording of the Act a man might be deaf in both ears to any extent short of complete deafness and still be entitled only to a gratuity. Will my hon. friend show me the clause showing that a man who is partially deaf in both ears is entitled to anything more than a gratuity?

Mr. NICKLE: It is impossible for me to point out the clause, because there is no such clause in the report. In each of the classes a few examples are given as to what constitutes the disability of that class. For instance:

> Class 5—Disability 20 per cent and less than 40 per cent—pension 20 per cent of Class 1.
> For example—Loss of one thumb. Anchylosis of elbow, knee, shoulder, wrist or ankle.

Anything not covered by specific instances in that report is within the discretion of the medical officers of the Pensions Board. They must determine the disability. That disability being determined, the pension is awarded in accordance with the schedules set out for the various classes.

Mr. EDWARDS: There is one encouraging feature about this debate, and that is that members on both sides of the House have shown a sincere desire to deal squarely by the soldier and his dependents. I am very glad indeed that the Pensions Act will not be put through this session, because I think we shall learn a great deal from experience by leaving it over until next session. No matter how carefully we might frame this Act, it would not cover all the cases that might be brought to our attention, and, therefore, I think it is a good thing to leave the matter open for a few months.

Personally, I think a mistake was made in ever recognizing the gratuity principle at all. I do not agree with the hon. member for Kingston that a soldier should have the option of choosing between a gratuity or a pension. A returned soldier when he comes back from the front is either 100 per cent fit, or he is not. If his disability is less than 20 per cent, he can accept the gratuity. Now in many cases it would be utterly impossible for any board to say that a 20 per cent defect would be entirely removed in two or three years, or that it would not have increased in that time to 40 or 50 per cent. Suppose we give the soldier the option of accepting a gratuity or taking a pension. If he accepts the gratuity, you are through with him; that is the point about it that I do not like. I do not think we should ever be through with the soldier, or that he should ever consider that the State is through with him.

Mr. CURRIE: The debate has shown that such is not the case. Even if a man gets a gratuity he can come back again.

Mr. MIDDLEBRO: Not after one year.

Mr. EDWARDS: If the soldier accepts a gratuity, that is the end of the matter so far as he is concerned. Now, if a soldier who has accepted a gratuity developed some disease which could be traced back to his service in the war, as he went about the country people would say to him: "You are not looking very well." "No, I developed this trouble through the war, when I served my country." People will naturally ask him: "Are you getting a pension?" "No, they only gave me $25," or $50 or $65, as the case may be. "That is all I get out of it." If one case of that kind can go through the country representing himself as having been finally disposed of by a gratuity of $25 or $50 or $100, and if the man is not as fit to perform his duties as he was before the war, I say it will be a dishonour and a disgrace to this country. I contend that every man who comes back from the front, no matter how slight his disability—I do not see how you can figure it on a 5, 10, 15 or 100 per cent basis—if he can show before a board that he is in the slightest degree less efficient than he was before he performed his service to the country, he should receive a pension in consideration of his lessened ability to provide for himself and his family, and he should be allowed to come before a board year after year to say either that he is entitled now to more than he used to get, because his disability is increasing, or that the board should declare him to be entirely fit, in which case, of course, he would not ask for a pension. I think the gratuity was a mistake from the start, and I think it continues to be a mistake to pay off a man with $25 or $50 or $100, as the case may be. He is either as efficient as he was before the war, or he is not. If he is as efficient as he was before, he does not want anything. If he is not as efficient, are you going to meet that condition by paying him off with a gratuity of $75 or $100? It strikes me as ridiculous, unreasonable, and illogical.

Mr. MIDDLEBRO: Coming back to the point I was discussing before, Class 6 is as follows:—

Class 6—Disability under 20 per cent, a gratuity not exceeding $100.

For example—Total deafness in one ear. Partial deafness in both.

Partial deafness in both ears means partial deafness in both ears, and I submit that a man may be nine-tenths totally deaf and still be in Class 6, and therefore not entitled to anything more than a gratuity of $100. I claim that it is not fair to pay off a man so afflicted with a gratuity of $100.

Mr. A. A. McLEAN: I should like to refer to the deductions which have recently been made in pensions. Since the Order in Council of June 30, reductions have been made in the pensions of men permanently injured in the war. Now I think that is absolutely against the provisions of the Order in Council, Section 8 of which is to the effect that each case shall be subject to review at the end of a year from the time the pension is first granted, except in those cases where the disability is obviously permanent, and then there shall be no further review. That is, if a man was receiving $11 a month, he could not at the expiration of a year, if he was permanently injured, have any reduction made in his pension. Yet, notwithstanding the fact that the injury is permanent, my information is that the pension has been reduced by the commission from $11 to $8 a month. It is evident from the provision of the Order in Council that if a man has a permanent injury and receives a pension, the pension remains as it was originally and must not be decreased. The idea of decreasing the pension is obviously against the meaning and purport of this Order in Council, and of the resolution which was passed in this House last May, and I would like to get the opinion of the Law Officers of the Crown in regard to it. There are a great number of cases in which those pensions have been reduced without any just cause or reason; they were reduced in contravention of the wording of this Order in Council.

Mr. CURRIE: Take the case of a man who comes back from the front, suffering from rheumatism which he has contracted in the trenches, say he is discharged and given a pension of forty per cent disability. Under treatment, he may recover. We all know rheumatism sometimes improves, and the man may be disabled by it for six months, and then he is all right. I think it would be very unjust if the rule did not apply both ways, because I feel there would be some cases of imposition. Speaking of deafness: it is extremely difficult to establish the degree of deafness from which a man may be suffering. As a matter of fact virtually every gunner and every bomber

at the front becomes partially deaf after being there for a while. If you followed the rule you would give a pension to every one at the front. I do not think the boys would want that sort of thing. I know some fellows myself who are partially deaf, but who have not mentioned the fact. They take it as part of the game. In regard to optional gratuity, I know of a case where a man came over from France on duty, and when he arrived here he was in perfect physical condition. He was ordered to go back to the front, and as soon as he received the order he developed a very bad case of rheumatism in the back. If he was boarded once, he was boarded fifteen times, but the doctors could not find anything wrong with him. The X-ray revealed nothing out of the ordinary. Still he could not move around. He got a gratuity, and inside of three months he was married, and is now carrying on his business just the same as he ever did. It was better to pay that gratuity than keep the man in the hospital for months and months, and then finally discharge him with a pension. The fact that he got a gratuity enabled him to recover and carry on his business the same as he always did. I know of many cases of imposition along these lines.

Mr. A. A. McLEAN: But, that is not the wording of the Order in Council. The Order in Council provides that a man who is permanently injured shall receive a pension, that is, a man who is suffering from an injury which will continue for the rest of his life. The wording of the Order in Council is that such a man is entitled to receive a pension, and that pension shall not be reduced. At the same time, the commissioners have reduced these pensions. Once a man is permanently injured, he comes under the Order in Council and gets his percentage, and that is not to be reduced. In reducing these pensions I believe the commissioners have been contravening the provisions of the Order in Council.

Mr. NICKLE: It is quite impossible to answer every specific case without knowing all the facts in reference to it. Dealing with the question of permanent disability—and I am now referring to class 2 of the scale as defined by the committee last year—take the case of a man who had lost both feet, that would be a permanent disability and he would be entitled to eighty per cent pension. Assuming further that at the time he came up for medical examination, in addition to the loss of both feet he was suffering from the results of a bullet wound through his lung, or was suffering radically from rheumatism, the commission would have put him in the 100 per cent class. Then, a year after, when he was re-examined, it might be found that his rheumatism was entirely better, or that his lung had been healed, in which event he would be put in the 80 per cent class in respect of his permanent injury. I quite understand and I am in accord with what my hon. friend from Prince Edward Island (Mr. A. A. McLean) has stated: If the disability is permanent, such as the loss of a hand, the loss of both feet, loss of tongue, loss of one foot, and so on, the injured man would get a pension, and the commissioners would have no right to lessen it. But, if in conjunction with such disability there is some other form of disability which yields to treatment, so that the man only suffers from the permanent disability, then he would fall within the class of which the permanent disability is given as an example.

Referring to the argument of the hon. member for Grey (Mr. Middlebro), if I may use the expression without using it offensively it is almost special pleading to say that partial deafness in both ears, no matter how excessive it may be, entitles a man only to a gratuity. When you read the paragraph in relation to class 4, you find it says that total deafness entitles a man to a pension of forty per cent. This, read in conjuntion with the disability allowed under class 6, clearly means that if a man is suffering from total deafness in both ears he gets a pension of forty per cent. If he is suffering from a trifling partial deafness in both ears, he may get a gratuity. If the deafness is of such character that it falls within the description of "total deafness in both ears" the man would come under class 4. My hon. friend says the word "trifling" does not appear in the report. That is perfectly true, but common sense must be applied to the construction and interpretation of the report, and I should be amazed to find that the pension commissioners had in mind that a man who is hurt, even in the slightest degree, is only entitled to a gratuity. Until a specific instance of the kind is brought to my attention, I shall not be inclined to believe it.

Now, as to whether or not a gratuity should be granted. One of the examples given as entitling a man to a gratuity is the loss of the index or other finger. Supposing a man lost a finger and says "I do not want to be bothered with this pension every three months, or every month; give me $150 down which will enable me to

buy a team of horses, and I can start work." If the individual is all right otherwise, I see no objection to his being given the $150. On the general principle of gratuities, I think the committee of last year made a mistake. I think we erred in saying that if a man suffered less than twenty per cent disability he should receive an amount not exceeding $100. That was not enough, and I think we should frankly admit where we have made mistakes so that we may lay the foundation of better things for the next year. Say a man lost a toe, or the top of his ear, or the tip of his nose, or some comparatively trifling thing which in no way impairs his earning capacity, why should he not be entitled to receive a lump sum if he so desires? I have given three months of my time to the study of the subject during this session.

Mr. McKENZIE: Does the hon. gentleman say that if a man has a piece off his nose it is a trifle?

Mr. NICKLE: I am only trying to give what I would call instances of trifling disability. On the general principle of pensions, you might discuss them from now until to-morrow morning and then go on and discuss them all day to-morrow and the House would not be very much nearer a conclusion than it is no now. My suggestion would be that the committee should agree to let this item pass on the distinct understanding that when the next Parliament meets a strong committee will, early in the session, take the whole question up, get the best evidence available and try to reach some conclusion which will do justice to all. I think the spirit of the House and the spirit of the country is that justice should be done to these men. We have one object in view and that is to see that everything that is fair and right is done by Parliament.

Mr. WEBSTER: What is the largest amount of gratuity paid?

Mr. NICKLE: Under the present regulations, which are, in view of the Order in Council, based on the report unanimously adopted by Parliament last year, the greatest gratuity that may now be paid is $100 where a man suffers a disability not exceeding twenty per cent.

Mr. OLIVER: I cannot agree that we should postpone further discussion of this question for the sake of taking it up at a succeeding session. Not having the advantage of having at my back a military voters' Bill and a franchise Bill, I may not be here next sesion, and I would like to do what I can on behalf of those who have served the country at the front. It is part of our responsibility to deal with the matter on their behalf, and I would like to discharge my share of that responsibility.

Mr. NICKLE: It never occurred to me that the hon. gentleman would not be here next session.

Mr. OLIVER: My hon. friend, I have no doubt, is so satisfied that he and his friends are thoroughly entrenched that our condition did not enter his mind. I do not think that the point raised by the hon. member for North Perth (Mr. Morphy) was altogether apprehended by the hon. member for Kingston. He spoke of those who had been awarded a gratuity. The reply to that was that if they had been awarded a gratuity on a certain condition of disability, on a change in that condition of disability, that award would be revised. That was not his pcint. Having been awarded a certain gratuity on a certain disability, he suggested that they might secure a revision of the award even though there was no change in physical condition, his contention being, and I think correctly, that in many cases men accepted a gratuity without provident consideration. A man returns from the front, he is glad to be free, he is able to resume the society of his friends, he does not want to be ranked as a kicker or a squealer, he is offered a small gratuity and he accepts it. The point that the hon. member for North Perth had in mind was that all gratuities should be subject to revision without consideration whether there was a change in the physical condition or not.

5 p.m.

Mr. NICKLE: In the report to which my hon. friend (Mr. Oliver) was a party last year there was a provision that there should be the right of appeal at any time, I think, within a year. A man only gets a pension if he is discharged. If he gets a pension and if at any time within a year he desires to appeal he can do so. At any time within a year there is a review if he desires it.

Mr. OLIVER: I still think that the review within a year was only for the purpose of taking into consideration a change in condition.

Mr. A. A. McLEAN: These Orders in Council provide that:

> All pensions awarded to members of the forces shall be determined by the disability of the applicant without reference to his occupation prior to enlistment.

The cases that I refer to were the cases of two men permanently injured. One lost his heel and another had an injury called anchylosis of the shoulder. They received $11 a month. The injuries to these men were obviously permanent. In the month of June these men were reduced from $11 to $8 a month. I had the certificates of independent medical men to whom these men went and who certified that their injuries were permanent. I claim that under clause 8 of the Order in Council they could not reduce the pensions of these men. It is true that if a man contracts rheumatism it would not be proper to continue his pension because that would not be a permanent injury. But these were injuries to the body, real injuries which will remain during the lives of these men. Yet the commission reduced the pensions. Once a man gets a pension he gets it for life. One of these men cannot move his arm beyond a certain height and he cannot engage in the business in which he was employed previous to going to the war. I understand that in England a man's previous occupation is taken into consideration when pensions are granted. But this clause was put in saying that a man's capability to engage in his previous occupation would not be taken into consideration. For that reason clause 8 was enacted to provide that where the disability was permanent there should be no reduction. I would ask the commissioners to take these two cases into consideration. I think they have read this provision wrongly and that they should not reduce men who are permanently injured as are the two men of whom I speak.

Mr. NICKLE: The commissioner explains how this particular case, of which the hon. gentleman (Mr. McLean) has just spoken, arose. Prior to the present regulations becoming law the pensions were divided into four degrees. There was a difference of $11 between each degree. At the end of the year, when the report was made law by Order in Council, all cases were reviewed and some of the degree pensions under the $11 clause were found to fall within clause 5—that is, the twenty per cent disability pension—with the result that in some few cases a degree pension of $11 enjoyed under the previous law was reduced to $8 under the law now in force. But the commissioner tells me there has been no reduction of pensions awarded for permanent disability under the Order in Council.

[Mr. A. A. McLean.]

Mr. A. A. McLEAN: He is wrong in that case. Those men were assigned a pension over a year before the Order in Council was passed.

Mr. NICKLE: That is my point.

Mr. A. A. McLEAN: I say that under this Order in Council the board had no power to reduce it.

Mr. NICKLE: That is exactly my point. Under the old law there were four degree pensions, each one varying from the one below it by $11. When this Order in Council No. 1334 was passed, it divided the pensions into six classes. Some of those in degree 4, drawing $11, fell into class 5, where their disability was 20 per cent, and that entitled them only to $8. In other words, under their degree of disability, their pension was $11, because there were but four classes, but under order 1334, when there were six classes, they were just over 20 per cent, and under 40 per cent, and they, therefore, received $8, being a reduction of $3, but there have been no cases of reduction under 1334 where the disability was permanent and without other complications. It was only a reduction in the degree of the pension.

Mr. MIDDLEBRO: This has the effect of reducing the permanent pension of these men, although they were put on a permanent basis under the old law. I think when the law was passed the effect of it was not understood, and I think an exception should be made in the case of those two men.

Mr. NESBITT. As a member of the committee that adopted the present pension scheme, I may say I think we did remarkably well, considering our experience. This pension Order in Council is not like the laws of the Medes and Persians. It can be rectified, if we find it is not a proper measure. So far as I have listened to the argument and statements of the different members this afternoon as to their troubles, I confess I think that these men should have allowed a review as to the gratuities. I am not in accord with the statement that gratuities should not be allowed in every case. Somebody has mentioned that we should have divided it into tenths, instead of fifths, because some people are on the borderland between two classes. If we divided it into twentieths, they would still be on the borderline between two classes, so that I do not think that would get over the trouble. It is quite possible we should have reduced this

to a tenth of disablement. We discussed that at the time, if I am not mistaken, but we thought after 20 per cent a gratuity would fill the bill. I am inclined to agree with the hon. member for Kingston that we made a mistake in fixing the maximum amount of gratuities at $100. I think all cases should be subject to review where there is complaint that an injustice has been done. I think the commissioner should be allowed to review downward, as well as upward, as far as that is concerned. There might have been too high a pension granted, in the first place, for something that was alleged to be permanent which was not really permanent. That is why I think review should be allowed in all cases. So far as my experience has gone, there has not been much complaint. No doubt there has been some complaint. I have several times brought instances to the notice of the commissioners, and, so far as I know, they have given prompt and diligent attention to the cases. Some one has said this afternoon that a good deal depended upon the local board. There is no doubt about that, and I do not see how it could be otherwise. Let all these men be sent before the commission, and let the commission review their cases, or let the commission go to these men and make a review. I have no doubt the Board of Commissioners will gain a great deal of wisdom as to the kind of Bill to be passed, when the Government makes up its mind to bring in a permanent Bill. In the meantime I think the commissioners should be open, at all times, to representations by reliable people as to the condition of any particular soldier, and if they were not satisfied with the finding of the local board, they should have that man appear before them. One of the commissioners might visit different points, instead of sitting in Ottawa all the time. If I am not mistaken, one of the commissioners went to Hamilton at one time, to look into some cases where there had been dissatisfaction, I understood from him that everything was made satisfactory before he left Hamilton. In such cases, perhaps, the commissioners might find it convenient to make investigations themselves. It is a vexed question, and I think the commissioners should maintain an open mind. Under the present Act, and as far as the present Order in Council is concerned, at the time we compiled it we did the very best we could in the interest of the men who have gone overseas, and I am sure in most cases the Act worked exceedingly well, I know one case where a man had his leg cut off very near the hip, and he asked to have his case reviewed. I do not know whether the case was reviewed or not, but if it was not it should have been, because his leg was cut off so close to the hip that it was a very exceptional case and he could not wear an artificial limb. I knew of another man who had pains in his head, and he did not know what caused them, but maintained that it was the result of service at the front. I think that case was reviewed. Cases of that kind will arise, and we will have to leave them very largely to the judgment of the commissioners.

Mr. McKENZIE: I am at the disadvantage of not being a member of this board. I presume the hon. gentlemen who compose it used the best judgment they could bring to bear upon this very important and intricate question. As in every other line of business, they should follow precedents. For instance, in the legal profession it will not do for a man to start to hew out a course for himself, and ignore all the cases that have been decided in the courts for generations. He must bring himself into line with precedent and practice, and that remark applies to the medical profession. Men have followed precedents in the treatment of cases as they have been dealt with by men in the profession for years, and it will not do for a medical man to ignore the experience of others and the effects of certain treatment.

The Government has the advantage of precedents established by other countries in dealing with cases of this kind. I should like to bring to the attention of the Pensions Board one or two considerations connected with the application of the word "disability." There are so many kinds of employment in the world that disability in one case would not be so great as disability in another, even though the injury might be the same. For instance, if a medical doctor lost a finger or sustained serious injury to one of his hands, his usefulness in his profession would be practically gone. On the other hand, if the same thing happened to a lawyer, the disability would not be so great, particularly if the right hand was not injured. But if the lawyer's hearing or eyesight is affected, the disability which he thereby suffers in the practice of his profession cannot very well be compensated. In the case of men engaged in mining occupations, of whom there are many in my part of the country, the use of every faculty is essential. These

men have to go down hundreds, sometimes thousands of feet under the ground; they have to walk miles underneath the surface of the earth before they get to their work; they have to handle explosives and tear down the face of the coal in the mines. If a man of that class is deprived of any one of his senses, he becomes at once useless to himself and, if he works in the mine, a great menace to those who work with him. No manager of a mine would care to have in his employ a man who suffered any disability. Accordingly, the board would have to exercise judgment in dealing with such cases as distinguished from cases of men engaged in other occupations—merchants, lawyers, engineers, persons following any other calling which is not a dangerous one. That which applies to miners applies also, in some degree, to fishermen and lumbermen. I should like to know from the member for Kingston (Mr. Nickle) who has taken a great interest in this work, how the classifications of disability are arrived at? Is the class into which a man is put decided by a medical expert? In a matter of such far-reaching importance we cannot move too cautiously in attempting to arrive at a definite rule as to how these men shall be dealt with. Further, I suppose, assuming that the physical disabilities are the same, that a man with a family will receive different consideration from that accorded to a man who has no dependents.

Mr. NICKLE: In regard to the first question, the table of disabilities was arrived at by the Pension Commissioners, gathering together the best information that they could get throughout the world, from workmen's compensation boards and other like bodies, as to how far any specific disability impaired a man's usefulness. Having collaborated these tables, they got a board of three of the most experienced men that they could find in Canada, together with a representative from the Workmen's Compensation Board, and prepared a table of disabilities covering practically every specific disability of which one could think. After the actual physical impairment of the man is determined, reference is made to the disability table, which defines the percentage of disability that the theoretic individual suffers; then the practical and the theoretical are brought together, with the result that the class into which the man would fall is decided.

As to my hon. friend's second question, if he will return to the report of last year he will see that the pensions scheme as originally worked out makes a specific allowance of so many dollars, according to rank and class, to a married man. There is a further provision that so much shall be allowed for each child in the family. I read from paragraph 14:

> That the disabled member of such force, up to and including the rank of lieutenant, entitled to a pension in the 1st, 2nd or 3rd class, in addition to his personal pension, be entitled to draw $6 a month for each child; of the rank of captain, $7 a month for each child, etc.

The larger the family, the larger the monthly allowance in respect of the children.

Mr. KYTE: I should like to draw the attention of the committee to this item which I see in this evening's Journal:

> It is understood that the new pensions for soldiers which are to be created by Order in Council will show not less than a 25 per cent increase. Lack of time prevented a measure being introduced in the House to grant increased pensions; therefore it will be done by Order in Council soon after Parliament prorogues.

I desire to ask the Prime Minister whether any such Order in Council has been passed?

Sir ROBERT BORDEN; No. All these conjectures in the press as to what the increase is to be are entirely without foundation, for the simple reason that the Government have not had opportunity to consider the matter. My hon. friend will realize that, during a very busy session of Parliament such as this, with the great demands upon our time and energies which are entailed in the prosecution of the war, we really have not had an opportunity to give matured consideration to the subject up to the present time. It is our hope and our intention, shortly after the prorogation of Parliament, to take the matter up and come to a conclusion about it. We shall then have the advantage of all that has been said in this House on the subject, the advantage, also, of knowing the views which have been communicated to us from time to time by those members of the Canadian Expeditionary Force who have returned to Canada and who have studied the subject with a good deal of thoroughness.

Mr. KYTE: I did not bring the matter up for the purpose of finding any fault.

Sir ROBERT BORDEN: I know that.

Mr. KYTE: I wished to have a statement from the Prime Minister. There is a good deal of dissatisfaction throughout the country as a result of discrimination in the rates

of pensions allowed to privates as compared with the rates allowed to officers. A very strong argument has been made this afternoon in this committee on behalf of granting as generous pensions as possible to returned soldiers on account of the increased cost of living and the difficulties they will have in making ends meet in their domestic arrangements. As a rule an officer is a man who occupies in the business world a position which is very much better than that of a private. Generally speaking, the men who are given commissions in the Canadian Expeditionary Forces are professional men, men who are engaged in business and largely those who are in the enjoyment of incomes apart altogether from their military income. The private is usually a man who depends entirely upon his daily labour for the support of his family, and when he gives up his ordinary avocation and joins the forces every source of income he formerly enjoyed is cut off. The necessity of adequately providing for the family of the private is just as great as the necessity of adequately providing for the family of the officer. Under those circumstances, I do not quite appreciate the reason for such a great difference in the scale of pensions between those two ranks. There may be very good reason for the distinction, and for the moment I am not criticising the Pensions Board or whoever it is that is responsible for drawing up the scale. But if there is any possible way by which the difference might be narrowed down so that the private could get a larger pension than he is now getting in comparison with the pension paid to the officer, it is very desirable that some such readjustment or recasting of the scale of pensions should be undertaken.

Sir ROBERT BORDEN: My hon. friend is, of course, aware that the scale of pensions as now in force was fixed upon the unanimous report of a committee of this House at the last session. That scale was brought into force by an Order in Council, failing legislation which it was not possible to pass at the last session. There is a good deal in the view which my hon. friend has put forward, but I do not know that I can follow him absolutely in all that he has suggested, because I myself know of a great many men, in the enjoyment of very good incomes, whether from business or professional work, who have enlisted in the Canadian Expeditionary Force as privates. I know some of them have been subsequently promoted, first to the rank of non-commissioned officer, and afterwards, on the field, to a commission. I do not, therefore, feel that there is any absolute rule which could be laid down precisely along that line. At the same time it is to be observed that the pensions were fixed, in the first instance, upon the basis of considerations which have more relevance to a permanent force rather than to a force of the character which is doing battle now for Canada and the Empire. It is not in contemplation, so far as I am aware, to increase the pensions of the officers. The increase which was spoken of is to be confined to the pensions of privates, and probably of non-commissioned officers, so in that way it is hoped that the purpose which my hon. friend has in view will, to some extent, be attained.

Mr. OLIVER: I want to refer to the remarks of the Minister of Customs in regard to the attitude of the Board of Pensions Commissioners. I do not wish to suggest that that board have prejudicial or ulterior motives against the claimants for pensions, but, in my judgment, they misapprehend their proper duties. From the instances I have seen, my conclusion is that the Board of Pensions Commissioners look upon themselves rather as the watch-dogs of the treasury than as a board appointed to see that the justice which the people of Canda want to give to those who have served them well, shall be given. They appear to me to be on the defensive all the time instead of being on the aggressive. Their attitude is rather that of men who are defending the treasury against raids by the returned soldiers than the attitude, which I conceive to be the proper one, of men whose business is to see that the returned soldier gets what is coming to him according to the wishes of the Canadian people. During the course of this discussion and during previous discussions, it has been held out that the Board of Pensions Commisioners are ready to consider and to reconsider claims that may be made to them. That is all very well. I wish to put this view before the committee as urgently and emphatically as I can, that, if that is the attitude of the Board of Pensions Commissioners, namely, that they will consider the cases that come before them, that is not an attitude in consonance with what I consider to be their duty. I take it that the obligation of the country to the soldier arises out of the service the soldier has rendered, and out of the consequences which he has suffered in the rendering of that service,

and it is not a matter of whether the soldier or a friend or somebody else brings the case to the attention of those in authority. The purpose of the people of Canada is that, when a soldier has suffered disability because of his service, that disability shall be recognized by the State adequately according to the law as laid down by whoever may have laid it down. When the soldier gives up his civil rights, when he not only becomes the servant of the State, but places himself absolutely, as to person and will, at the disposal of the State, the State is thereby obligated to see, on its own behalf, for the protection of its own honour, that any prospect that has been held out to the soldier in connection with the offer of his services shall be carried out to the letter, and without any demand on his part. I am speaking now on the basis of the argument as it has been put before the House to-day and on former occasions.

I am assuming that there is a condition in which claims have to be pushed before the Board of Pension Commissioners. There should be no such thing as pushing a claim before the Board of Pension Commissioners. When a man has suffered a disability, preceding his discharge there should be a full consideration of his case by the Board of Pension Commissioners, who should render their judgment, so that as soon as the soldier is discharged his award would be awaiting him without any question and without any necessity for his making an appearance or presenting a case, and without any consideration of whether he had friends or not. If I may be pardoned the use of the slang term, "it does not listen good to me" to hear member after member declare in this House that the cases he has brought before the Board of Pension Commissioners have been favourably considered. My contention is that there should be no necessity for any such action by any member of Parliament, or by anybody else, and when a condition exists where such action is necessary, and I presume it was necessary in the interests of those concerned, it discloses to me a condition that is undesirable and not in accord with my understanding of the proper functions of the Board of Pension Commissioners, or with the will and wish of the Parliament and people of Canada. It is out of that attitude of mind that has grown this question of improper and insufficient gratuities. I feel strongly on this point for several reasons. One is because there has been a tremendous rendering of service on the part of the country in which I live, and I feel, therefore, a particular interest in those who have suffered because of their service. I feel a further interest as a member of this House, as representing the people, to see that the honour and good faith of the Parliament of Canada are absolutely kept with those who have served with honour and credit and with such terrible losses to themselves. It is for these reasons that I urge strongly this view, and that I present to the House my opinion that in the whole consideration of this question of pensions the tendency has been to unduly scale down the pensions to which the men were entitled.

A committee of the House drafted a certain scale of pensions, I repeat that this was a minimum scale, even at that time. That scale has been placed in a position of still greater inadequacy by the subsequent increase in the cost of living, and the great failure to meet conditions as they are has been on the part of the Board of Pension Commissioners in unduly scaling down pension claims; that is, giving a man 60 per cent when he should have had 80 per cent, or giving him a gratuity when he should have had 20 per cent. I wish it to be understood that I am taking this position, not with any view of making undue criticism of the Pension Board or of the Government or of any person, but because I am deeply impressed with the conditions as they appear to me, and I think I should be doing very much less than my duty, on my responsibility as a member of this Parliament, if I did not present my views to the House in all possible frankness.

Mr. NICKLE: The sincerity of the hon. member (Mr. Oliver) is my only excuse for rising. The practice is this: Before a man can be discharged a medical board determines whether or not he has suffered a disability. If they report that he has suffered a disability on account of the war, a report of his condition goes to the Pension Commissioners, who determine what pension the man is to have. By an Order in Council passed on the 24th of February, 1917, it is provided that no man can be discharged who is suffering from a disability, until his pension has been determined. The Pension Commissioners notify the hospital where the man is that his pension has been determined, and he is as a rule discharged at the end of the next month, and his cheque for the first month's pension is awaiting him at his home. This procedure was necessitated by unfortunate circumstances that arose in the early pension administration, under which men were

discharged before their pensions was determined. Sometimes a month or so would elapse before a discharged soldier would get his first cheque, and there were undoubtedly cases of hardship in that way. Since attention was directed to that fact, the Order in Council has been passed, and the result now is that no disabled man is discharged until the Pension Commissioners say that they have determined his pension. When that has been done, he is discharged on the last day of the month or the first of the next and his cheque is awaiting him when he gets home.

Mr. KYTE: There has been a good deal of complaint from returned soldiers in the county of Cape Breton. I have in mind the case of a man who wrote me two weeks ago, who returned from the front four months ago. He received no military pay and no pension, and in order to support his family he had to go back and work in the mines under conditions that were extremely onerous; the work was very difficult indeed for him to perform. I should like to know what is the procedure with regard to soldiers who have returned disabled. Do they go to Halifax to be examined by a medical board, or are they examined locally, to determine whether they are entitled to a pension?

Mr. NICKLE: When a man lands in Canada he is examined at Quebec or Halifax, and sent to the military district from which he enlisted, where, assuming he requires treatment, he goes under the care of the Military Hospitals Commission. The procedure from that time on is, as I have outlined to the hon. member for Edmonton.

Mr. OLIVER: I wish to draw attention to certain further memoranda forwarded to me by the Citizens Committee of Edmonton. I have already read the memorandum in which they make the assertion that the present pensions of dependents of deceased soldiers are too low, and in which they mention a particular case. They also bring forward two other classes of cases which are a little out of the ordinary but which should, I think, be brought to the attention of the committee. They are cases in which no pension has been granted under the strict interpretation of the Pensions Regulations. In reference to the case of George Lennox Buchanan, they say:

> This is the orphan son of a soldier who was undergoing a term of imprisonment, and who had shown such good conduct that his term was shortened. Upon release he enlisted, went overseas and was killed on active service. His wife is also dead. The child referred to was adopted under the provincial regulations governing the Department of Neglected Children of Alberta. This was a real act of charity on the part of George Buchanan and his wife, who adopted the child. They have no children of their own and are an old couple. At present the boy has a splendid home, but they have no resources and at their deaths could leave no estate. The foster father feels that this child should receive pension, and is willing to execute any trust whereby any pension or sum of money granted on behalf of the child should be kept for his sole use and benefit in order that he may receive a proper education.

The point is, the orphan son of a deceased soldier was adopted by an old couple, who are able to provide for the child while they live, but who are certain not to live very long, and before the child would be able to earn his own livelihood he would be left destitute.

Sir ROBERT BORDEN: Was the adoption before the father enlisted?

Mr. OLIVER: No, it was after the death of the father, on the death of the mother.

Mr. NICKLE: As I understand it, it was on the death of the mother, but before the father enlisted.

Mr. OLIVER: I could not say definitely as to that. The only information I have is what is contained in the memorandum.

Mr. NICKLE: The commissioner tells me he remembers the case quite distinctly. The child was regularly and legally adopted by this couple when the father was in prison. When the father was released, he went to the war and was killed. The commissioners took the position that as under the law the father was released from any obligation to the child, the parental responsibility having been assumed by the couple adopting the child, no pension was paid in respect of the death of the father.

Mr. OLIVER: I have no personal knowledge of this case. The memorandum was sent to me through the mail, and I present it just as it came to me. The explanation given by the hon. member from Kingston (Mr. Nickle) is an explanation which does not, to use a slang expression, "listen good" to the ordinary people of the country. The father of this child, whatever he was, gave his life for the country, and the country owes something to the child, at least that is the way the ordinary man looks at it. I want to assure the committee that the gentlemen who sent these representations are a committee of the prominent citizens of Edmonton, who have gathered together for the purpose of looking after such cases. It is not a partisan committee in any sense

of the word, and it has nothing to do with politics. They also mention the case of Mary L. Richmond, to which they refer as follows:

> Oliver C. Richmond, the son of this woman, enlisted and went overseas, serving some time at the front, and was then invalided home and died some time after his return. It seems there is some difficulty in getting the pension for this mother, claiming that the boy had a pre-disposition to tuberculosis, and that if he had not gone to the front he would not have died. The facts are, he went, came home and is dead, and there seems to be some finesse on the part of the doctors as to whether he really died because of exposure at the front or not. One doctor stated that there were latent conditions, which, to quote his own words, "were lit up by the strain of the soldier's service at the front." There is no doubt that this woman is entitled to a mother's pension for her son, who at the time of his enlistment was proceeding to his examinations in law and would have been a great support and help to her in years to come.

I have no doubt the Board of Pension Commissioners found reasons under the law for not granting the pension in this case, but assuming the facts to be as stated, and I have no reason to think otherwise, their action does not appeal to me—and I do not think it appeals to citizens generally—as a case of keeping faith with those who have rendered the most praiseworthy service to the country.

Mr. NICKLE: That is one of the classes of cases to which I alluded earlier in the afternoon when I said I thought the committee, with the limited knowledge they had at their disposal last year, overlooked a very serious situation which is going to arise in a great many instances. By our report, we make provision only for the case of those who are solely or mainly dependent on the deceased soldiers. The committee did not take into account at all the question of prospective dependents, such, for instance, as the case of a widow who was educating her son and spending possibly the savings of her husband's lifetime, or his insurance money, in order to give the boy the advantage of a proper education. In the drafting of this report the committee laid down as a condition precedent to the granting of a pension to a dependent, as distinguished from a pension to a wife who receives pension as of right, that it was only granted where the mother or other dependent was wholly or mainly dependent on the deceased soldier. If the legislation had come to the House this year, that is one of the aspects of the question which would have required very careful consideration,

and in my judgment the House would have had to decide what policy should be pursued in relation to this prospective dependency. It is a most serious question, and it comes back to the point raised by my hon. friend from South Oxford (Mr. Sutherland) in regard to insurance, as to whether or not it was advisable that something should be done by which a compulsory insurance might be put into effect so that there would be something available for those who were left in the event of the man being killed. In my judgment, the committee failed to make provision for just the class of cases to which my hon. friend from Edmonton (Mr. Oliver) has directed attention, and which in many instances have resulted in great hardship throughout the country.

Mr. OLIVER: It seems there is some difficulty in getting a pension for this woman, because her son had a predisposition to tuberculosis. Supposing that under the literal interpretation of the recommendations of the committee last year, this woman would not be entitled to compensation I sill think that the business of a judge is to render justice and not merely to interpret the law. His interpretation. I still think that the business of a ing justice, and I think, much more than in the case of the judge, the business of the commission is to render justice and not merely to interpret the law. However, I wish to say that without prejudice. I am merely taking a position which I think is in accord with the general view of the people of the country.

There is another point that this committee raises that will have a serious bearing, particularly when compulsory service is instituted. It is a very serious matter. We have found serious cases under the voluntary system, and they will be very much more serious, I am afraid, under the compulsory system. These are cases where people have financial obligations, and they have no means of carrying them when they have no resources other than the pension. I will give a few instances. I am quite aware that they are outside of the ordinary matter of pensions. We have never considered these cases as being entitled to pensions, but in Great Britain, under the Compulsory Service Act, they are taking into account such cases as these. Under our proposed Compulsory Service Act we will also be warranted in taking note of such cases as the following:

Hannah Lord.—This woman's pension is $32 per month. Previous to the enlistment of her husband, they purchased a lot for $600 upon which $400 has been paid. Interest and taxes for two years are still unpaid.

Amy Bloomer.—This woman's pension is $34 per month. Previous to the enlistment of the soldier they purchased a lot for $2,400, upon which they erected a store and barn for $2,600. There is a mortgage against this property for $2,000, interest overdue $95, taxes about $94. There is no income from this property at present, nor will there be any until times "pick up" in this city. The total income of this widow is $50, including the pension. The $16 per month will be reduced as years go by. The widow stated to our committee that unless some help could be obtained until times get good again, she will lose her equity in this property.

Mary E. Marsden.—This woman's pension is $56 per month. She owns a house and lot valued at $5,000 against which there is a mortgage of $1,200. The widow states that she can just live on the pension she receives, and can pay the taxes after severe sacrifices, but cannot see how it is possible to redeem the property before foreclosure.

Sir ROBERT BORDEN: What has been urged by my hon. friend will be taken into consideration by the Government. It seems rather particularly relevant to the cases of men who enlist under compulsory service. My hon. friend says that the question has been taken up and dealt with in England under their Compulsory Service Act.

Mr. OLIVER: I understand so.

Sir ROBERT BORDEN: I shall have an examination made as to what has been done in Great Britain in that regard for the purpose of assisting us in arriving at a reasonable and fair conclusion as to what could be done along the same lines in this country.

At six o'clock the committee took recess.

After Recess.

The Committee resumed at eight o'clock.

Mr. OLIVER: For the purpose of calling attention to the matters that were brought forward by the Citizens' Committee at Edmonton, I will read a statement of the classes into which these cases are divided.

Class "A"—Cases where the soldier's widow has property encumbered or mortgaged and is unable to discharge the indebtedness from savings from Pension Fund allowance.

Class "B"—Cases where pension is insufficient at the present time with regard to the high cost of living.

Class "C"—Cases where no pension has been granted owing to strict interpretation of the pension regulations.

These are the three classes of cases which I have already placed before the House, and in regard to which there has been some measure of discussion. I wish to instance another case which came under my notice, not in regard to pensions, but in connection with the administration of the Patriotic Fund—and I allude to it merely to establish the fact that a very serious situation may arise in regard to the equities in encumbered property when the Military Service Bill is put into force. The case I refer to is that of a woman whose husband volunteered early in the war. They had a house and lot assessed at $6,000 upon which there was a mortgage of $2,500 The mortgage matured, subsequent to the man's enlistment. The mortgagees foreclosed and claimed possession of the property. The soldier's wife contested the action and retained possession by occupation. The matter came to my attention through the fact that the woman was a claimant on the Patriotic Fund, and her Patriotic Fund allowance was withheld, to either be diverted or to compel her to pay rental to the mortgagees. I bring that instance before the committee, not to discuss the administration of the Fund, but to show how such cases may arise—where a man not only suffers the ordinary disabilities incidental to serving his country instead of serving himself, but is penalized in large amounts. This case is not one of pension at the present time. But if the man had been killed the woman would have lost not only her support but her property because of the patriotic service rendered by her husband.

Mr. R. B. BENNETT: The case my hon. friend mentions is one that is not peculiar to his own community. There has been a considerable number of these cases in the West, and my little investigation at a distance by correspondence leads me to believe there is in these cases no greater hardship—outside of casualties in the field—than that endured by those who remain at home, owing to conditions following upon real estate in western Canada having assumed its present aspect. I should like to know to what conclusion my hon. friend's investigation leads him.

Mr. OLIVER: Before six o'clock I read the recommendation of the Edmonton Citizens' Committee, forwarded by the Hon. A. C. Rutherford, and I made the suggestion, of which the Prime Minister approved, that the same condition is found to exist in England under the Compulsory Military Service Act and that they are taking some means to minimize the hardship. I do not know what means

they are taking, or how far they are carrying it. I think the proposition is that the Government shall assume the responsibility up to a certain limited amount.

Mr. R. B. BENNETT: These are cases of compulsory service.

Mr. OLIVER: I was alluding to this on account of the Military Service Act coming into force. I think that we as a country should not give less consideration, but if possible even more consideration, to those who are called up than to those who volunteered freely. It is hard to make such a statement, but I think that proposition is fair.

Mr. R. B. BENNETT: They would probably, having regard to the terms of the regulation be exempt here when they would not in England.

Mr. OLIVER: That may be. I thought it was only right to draw attention to this fact, and to urge, as the committee at Edmonton has urged, that the cases that have already occurred under voluntary service should receive such consideration as is within the scope and possibilities of the Government. There is another resolution of this committee that I desire to place before the House. It reads:

> That the pension of a widowed mother be the same as that of a wife, provided her son or sons who has or have been killed in action or died on active service were at the time of enlistment or subsequently thereto her sole support.

I do not know how far this goes beyond the present regulation, but I have read it for the purpose of putting it before the Government.

Mr. GRAHAM: The question of pensions is a very important one, and no matter what policy Parliament adopts that policy will not be easily carried out. There must of necessity be cases of injustice at some points. It ought to be, and I believe it is, the policy of Parliament and of the Government to render these cases just as few and far between as possible. The hon. member for Kingston (Mr. Nickle) and the hon. member for North Oxford (Mr. Nesbitt), I think, made some reference this afternoon to insurance.

If I am rightly informed, the men who are to be called upon under the Military Service Act will not be in as good a position as the men overseas have been in the matter of protecting themselves by insurance. I was informed yesterday that several of the leading life insurance companies had instructed their agents to solicit no more insurance on single men, or widowers with families, who were between the ages of the first class to be called. In other words, the insurance companies do not propose to take any risks upon the first 100,000 men who will be called up. It is quite probable that if the required number of men is not secured by the first call, the same attitude will be taken by the insurance companies in reference to the men liable to service in the next draft. This may have something to do with the question of pensions, because the men drafted will not be in as good a position to protect those whom they are leaving behind, no matter what means they have, as were those who have already gone over. Previously, policyholders were at liberty after the expiration of three years, to go wherever they liked; their taking part in the war had no effect upon the amount of their premium. Those who enlisted later had to pay a larger premium or have their policies cancelled. The fact that the insurance companies have asked their agents not to accept any more applications from men between the ages—

Mr. R. B. BENNETT: That is not universal, is it?

Mr. GRAHAM: I do not know; this information came to me yesterday. This condition will make it all the harder for those who go to protect those whom they leave behind, and it will impose upon the State a greater burden and a greater responsibility.

Mr. R. B. BENNETT: They are endeavouring to select for military service unmarried men in preference to married men.

Mr. GRAHAM: I am speaking of unmarried men liable to call under the first class, and widowers without families, between the ages of 20 and 34. I wish the member for Kingston to answer two questions. First, when a man reverts in rank, will his family, if the occasion arises, receive pension on the basis of the rank that he held when he left Canada, or on the basis of the lower rank subsequently assumed? Second, what is the position of men, so far as pension is concerned, who, having enlisted with the Canadian Expeditionary Forces, subsequently became attached to the British forces? Will they have to rely upon the British Act in the matter of pensions?

Mr. NICKLE: The British Act.

Mr. REID: If a man who reverts in rank is killed, the widow gets a pension based

upon the rank held by her husband when he landed in England. But if, holding the lower rank, the man is wounded, he would, according to the present regulation, receive pension based upon the rank that he held when wounded. That is a matter that should be reconsidered. The resolutions read by the member for Edmonton (Mr. Oliver) are certainly worthy of very serious consideration; they go to show that the whole matter of pensions should again be gone into. The present regulations, as I stated earlier in the day, were all worked out by a committee of the House. When these regulations were made, the members of the House were of one mind in their desire to see that the provisions were fair and just and in the interests of those overseas. But, like any other regulations, it is a hard thing to make them perfect. They must be taken up from time to time and amended; the difficulties arising under their operation must frequently be considered. Any persons who feel that they have a grievance or a claim to make will certainly communicate with the member for their constituency, who knows just what should be done in the matter. In fact, even if we had amended the regulations, we should still have cases of injustice—not intentional on the part of the pension commissioners, but arising naturally in connection with the administration of the regulations. The Government simply carried out the report of the committee in appointing the Board of Pension Commissioners. We feel that the Act should be amended; that certain cases under which claims arise should be considered; that any errors should be corrected. Under the present Act any person who considers that his case had not been justly dealt with has the right to appeal within one year.

Even if there have been cases in which the time has elapsed, the committee that will be appointed to decide on an amended Bill under which the pensions will be administered can easily insert in it a clause to cover such cases. We are all agreed on endeavouring to do what is right to those who have gone overseas and to make the Act as perfect as possible. The Board of Pension Commissioners, however, must do what is fair, not only to the soldier, but to the country. There have been presented to the board cases in which the parties had no right whatever to pensions. While I would not want to say that there have been many such cases, there have been some, and, therefore, it is necessary for the board to investigate every case very closely. I also believe there are a number of cases in which an injustice has been done to the soldier, but that injustice has generally been caused by the way in which the papers have been filled out on behalf of the soldier by other parties. I know of a case in which a clergyman filled out the papers, and the board, on the information given to them in those papers, could not have acted otherwise than as they did, but when the matter was drawn to their attention it was at once looked into and when it was seen that there had been injustice the injustice was remedied. At the next session of Parliament all these matters must be taken up, and during the recess the whole matter can be taken up, and the report of the committee of last year revised and improved upon in such a way as to minimize as much as possible the causes of complaint. Even if the Act is framed in accordance with the best ability of Parliament, it will be found that complaints in regard to its administration will still be made.

Mr. OLIVER: I would not wish to delay the committee longer on the subject, and I quite appreciate the spirit in which the minister (Mr. Reid) has spoken. As he says, we are all desirous of seeing that these men receive their rights according to the wishes of the people of Canada. At the present time, however, we are not working under an Act of Parliament; we are working under an Order in Council that is capable of amendment at the discretion and on the responsibility of the Government. So, if we consider the enactment not to be final, we are in a better position to-day to meet new and unforeseen circumstances by amending the Order in Council, than we would be if we were working under an Act of Parliament. I would respectfully suggest that that fact might be taken into consideration, and that where there is found to be a class of cases not provided for under the present Order in Council, an amendment might be made to it in order that justice might be done. I would not, for one moment, wish that the Board of Pension Commissioners should not look into every case very carefully. I fully appreciate the fact that they have a responsibility to discharge towards the country in protecting the public moneys, but my complaint was—and I am going to take the liberty of repeating it—that their attitude is that they are rather the guardians of the treasury than the champions of the disabled soldiers. My point is that their main duty is the championship of the rights of

the soldiers. The protection of the treasury is part of their duty, but it is rather the second than the first duty. The Board of Pension Commisioners should create a sympathetic atmosphere in and through their administration, so that the disabled soldier and his friends would feel that, instead of his having to go up against opposition, he was appealing to friends who were making it their business to see that he got justice. I know it is not possible to please every one. I know there are people who make improper claims. I quite appreciate the difficulties that any Board of Pension Commissioners must encounter. But I make the straight and plain criticism that I do not think there has been created that atmosphere of sympathy with the soldier that would lead to more satisfactory administration, and that in the end would work out very much better for the country.

Mr. REID: Criticism on this matter is necessary, and will do a great deal of good. This is a matter of great importance. Very many good citizens of this country have gone to the front and made tremendous sacrifices, and on account of those sacrifices many are now dependent upon the pensions awarded. If, therefore, there is any suggestion or criticism that can be made in this House, should be made. After discussing the matter with the three Pension Commissioners, my impression is that their sympathies are with the soldiers, but any one who has a grievance would probably find fault with them. Criticism of the kind offered is a good thing, because it shows the board exactly what may be thought of their work, and it will do no harm. The Government, therefore, court criticism in this matter. It must be dealt with and decided upon by members on both sides of the House. We are trying to carry out the decision of last year just as it was put through this House, except for amendments of the Order in Council which experience has shown to be necessary and which we have the power to make. There are not many cases of injustice, but there are some that have come before the ministers, and, so far as the Government are concerned, they will do what they can to remedy any injustice.

At the same time my hon.friend can readily understand that when Parliament has decided on certain regulations for administering pensions, the Government would naturally hesitate to make any serious changes in those regulations until the whole matter had been laid before Parliament.

[Mr. Oliver.]

The Prime Minister in his remarks this afternoon intimated that these matters would all be considered. They will be considered, and the discussion that has taken place here to-day will be read by every minister of the Government, and anything we can do towards remedying any grievance will certainly be done between now and the day when Parliament next meets, when this whole question will be taken up and finally dealt with.

Mr. E. M. MACDONALD (Pictou): I am sorry I did not have the opportunity of being in the House earlier in the afternoon when this matter was under consideration. I had the honour of being a member of the committee which considered the question of pensions last year, and I recall that the feeling of the committee was that in regard to a great many question we were necessarily working in the dark, and that it was necessary that there should be a revision during the present session of Parliament of the recommendations which we made. I notice that the Minister of Finance has had on the Order Paper since June 11 a resolution which apparently he intended to move, to provide for the revision which we expected last year would take place. A great many questions came before the committee on which it was felt that we could not pronounce with any finality. We felt that a year's experience in working out the problems that arose, together with the experience of the members in regard to their constituents, would help in perfecting an Act this year.

I also desire to recall that it was unanimously agreed by the committee that the men who were to compose the Pensions Board should be chosen after consultation with the leader of the Opposition. That understanding was embodied in the first report presented to the House. But at the request of the Chairman of the Committee, the present Minister of Marine and Fisheries (Mr. Hazen), it was agreed that as the terms of the report were to form part of an Order in Council, that recommendation should not be made, it being understood, however, that in accordance with the wishes of the committee the idea would be carried out. I regret to say that the Prime Minister (Sir Robert Borden) did not carry it out, though I personally called his attention to the matter in a letter I addressed to him, and although the fact of this understanding having been arrived at was stated in the House when the matter was under discussion on the very

day the House adjourned last session. I think it would have been very much better if the Prime Minister had carried out the idea. The Pension Board ought to be composed of men, and administered under conditions entirely free from political influence. The suggestion that there would be any politics in connection with the administration of the pensions regulations would only be an injury to the Government responsible for carrying them out. I have no hesitation in saying that I regard the Prime Minister as not having carried out his word on this subject. As I have already said, the statement that this understanding had been arrived at was made in his presence at end of last session; and where a thing of that kind is done by common consent all parties should show good faith in the matter.

I have no fault to find with the personnel of the commission. I think that the gentlemen who compose it have approached the consideration of the problems before them with the highest possible ideals, and with a desire to render the best public service. But I cannot help regarding it as most regrettable that the intention of the committee, as expressed, was not carried out, and that the commission, which might have been composed practically as it is now, was not appointed in accordance with that understanding. My hon. friends who were members of that committee will recall that what I am stating in that particular is absolutely correct.

I think it is unfortunate that the Government did not submit the pensions regulations for revision at this session of Parliament. I charge the Government with being negligent in their duty in permitting this motion to stand on the Order Paper for over three months without calling in the aid of the Pensions Board and the services of the committee which sat last year, or some other committee of Parliament which had given some study to the question.

Mr. ROSS: The Canadian Northern was more important.

Mr. MACDONALD: My hon. friend says the Canadian Northern was more important. I do not think it was. I think that the proper regulation of pension matters is of the very greatest importance to the people of this country. I think that the whole terms of the Order in Council and the report of the committee that was made last year could well have been revised in the light of the experience we have all had in the meantime. The thousand complexities which human nature presents in the ordinary affairs of life do not begin to indicate the tremendous problems with which I have come in contact in my experience with the men of my own constituency who have gone to the front, and in regard to their friends at home who have been bereaved. Problems have arisen which I had no conception of when, as a member of the committee, I studied this question last year.

This whole question of pensions is wrapped up with the question of the treatment of the men who have gone overseas, and their conditions of service. I think Canada is paying the boys at the front entirely too little money; I think we should pay them more. I think the Government should have taken up long ago the question of insuring the men who go to the front. That problem ought to be taken into consideration in working out the details of any pension scheme. Apparently, in regard to both these problems the Government is prepared to let matters remain as they are. In comparison with the United States, which has organized in a splendid way in every department that is necessary to maintain their position in the war, this Government shows in a very poor light, in whatever branch of the war you care to mention. The policy of this Government has been haphazard from the beginning. "Anything for the moment," has been its policy.

Mr. SCHAFFNER: That is a real scold.

Mr. MACDONALD: My hon. friend need not worry. He is one of those seraphic beings who could not say anything no matter what the Government did. I would point out that hon. gentlemen on this side of the House who have criticised the Government in the matter of pensions are simply carrying out the suggestion which the minister made a short time ago, when he said that this Government would not know what to do unless they had some criticism in order to help them along the right path. I am, therefore, performing a duty in the interests of the Government. I say that it is a scandal that this whole question of pensions should have been allowed to stand as it is. My hon. friend intimates that there is going to be an Order in Council to increase the pensions. That should have been a matter for consideration by hon. members of this House, and for a committee of this House, entirely apart from any question of party.

There is another matter. With reference to the rules incorporated in the Order in

Council, I think we should have given, and should give now, to the Pensions Board, wider discretion in regard to the numerous cases which are liable to arise and which will prove exceptions to the general rules we laid down. I have in mind one or two instances. A father whose boy has been killed at the front, or has died as the result of injuries received or disease contracted or aggravated while on active service, is entitled to a pension in class 3.

I have in mind the case of a poor old workingman in my county. Two of his elder sons were married. One of the younger boys upon whom he largely depended for getting along worked in one of the industries nearby. This boy went to the front and was killed. The man's wife died in the meantime. His second son volunteered and went to the front, and the younger boy did not give his father half of his pay. The result is, the old man is practically destitute. Under the conditions and rules which have been laid down, the Pension Board cannot see its way clear to give him anything. This is an instance in which the pension commissioners ought to have wider discretion, and if the opportunity had been afforded us to deal in review with the regulations which were laid down last year, I would have urged, if I had been on the committee, that wider discretionary power should be given to the commission to deal with such cases. Another case is that of a widowed mother, one of whose boys went to the front and was killed. Her husband died in the meantime. She has another son, sixteen years old, who is not much good. She is in receipt of a pension under the regulations, which will cease the moment that boy reaches the age of seventeen or eighteen, and he will probably turn out to be no good whatever. This poor woman is bereft of the one who might have been able to help her, and under the regulations she is cut off from receiving any pension. If wider discretion were left with the board to deal with cases of this kind, undoubtedly she would be looked after. Let me give still another case. A man who had been through the South African war volunteered for service overseas. While training in Halifax he was thrown and broke his kneecap. Of course it was impossible for him to go overseas. He was allowed a pension and he still walks lame, and will be lame for the rest of his life. Before he enlisted he was a coal miner, and of course it is impossible for him to engage in coal mining again.

[Mr. Macdonald.]

Mr. NICKLE: Was he injured on this side of the Atlantic?

Mr. MACDONALD: Yes, but he was in the overseas forces, and he would have been entitled to a pension, so that the case comes within the purport of these regulations. While the shell manufacturing was going on he got some work in that industry, but this is now stopped. I received a letter from him the other day in which he tells me that on the principle of bad luck never coming singly, he has received word from the Pension Board to the effect that, basing themselves upon some medical report, he is not to receive any more pension. I have no doubt the Pension Board is dealing with this case in accordance with the regulations. I intend to call upon the board for the purpose of giving this man's name, and the full particulars. The net result of the whole thing is that he is lame for life and cannot engage in his usual occupation, and his pension is being cut off because, I apprehend, the board is tied down by the letter of the law as incorporated in the Order in Council. The Government are taking full responsibility for this law; they have not consulted Parliament in regard to the matter and apparently have decided that they would not do so. They propose to deal with the question by Order in Council. With all the complexity of the problems that must come before any Parliament in this country, we have allowed a year to go by without any revision of those pension regulations. I regard this as very unfortunate. The difficulty will not be met by simply increasing the amount of the pensions. There must be a total revision of these regulations along certain lines, and the Government, with an election upon them and with all the problems to be dealt with in the next six months, will not be able to give this question the consideration to which it is entitled. I believe the Pension Board is determined to do what is right, and I believe we may safely trust them. At the same time, I regard it as most unfortunate that the Government has allowed a year to elapse without dealing with the problem, and that we are now coming to the end of this Parliament with a law which is practically a year and a half old, without the benefit of the changes suggested by the experience which has been gathered in the time intervening, and that we cannot look for any immediate improvement or change in the law upon a permanent basis or upon such lines that calm deliberation and intelligence and care ap-

plied to the framing of a law would produce.

Mr. REID: My hon. friend from Pictou (Mr. Macdonald) first complains that in the appointment of this commission he understood the committee had suggested——

Mr. MACDONALD: I did not understand it; I knew it.

Mr. REID: My hon. friend says he knew the committee had recommended that the leader of the Opposition should be consulted in the appointment of this commission. This is the first time I have heard of it.

Mr. MACDONALD: Let me say to my hon. friend that it was stated in Parliament on a motion to adopt the report of the committee. The Minister of Marine and Fisheries moved the adoption of the report last year, and I seconded. If my hon. friend will look at Hansard he will see that my statement is correct.

Mr. REID: I do not doubt my hon. friend's statement at all. He also told us he had written a letter to the Prime Minister. This is the first I have heard of it. Probably I was not in the House when the discussion took place. If the Prime Minister had that understanding I am quite satisfied he must have overlooked it, and that he had no intention whatever of not fully carrying out any understanding which may have been arrived at. In any event, even if a mistake were made so far as the understanding is concerned, my hon. friend agrees that the three commissioners who were appointed were men in whom the people of Canada had every confidence. I think that in making the selection the Prime Minister chose men whom no person would criticise as being unfair in the administration of those pension regulations. So far as concerns the submission of the Bill at this session, I may say that the notice on the Order Paper referred to by my hon. friend was simply a notice of a Bill authorizing the appointment of the Board of Commissioners, not of a Bill to establish the rate of pensions. The reason no Bill was submitted this session is that we have not had an opportunity of submitting one. I think every member of this House will agree that we have had most important legislation from the time the Prime Minister came back in May down to the present moment, legislation that had to go through, legislation that could not wait. The financial Bills and the other Bills had to go through; there can be no doubt about that. Even the Canadian Northern Railway Bill, to which my hon. friend refers, was a Bill which had to go through, otherwise there would be a financial crisis in the country.

Mr. MACDONALD: It is going to make one anyway.

Mr. REID: No, it will not.

Mr. MACDONALD: It will make a worse crisis than if nothing at all had been done.

Mr. REID: No. That Bill had to go through, and the other Bills had to go through, and this session has been kept busy. I believe that in the twenty-six years that I have been here there never has been as much important legislation passed as during the present session.

Mr. MACDONALD: There never was so much bad legislation.

Mr. REID: It is all good legislation. The present pension law is administered in the same way as if it had been a law passed by Parliament. Anything that is necessary to meet the situation or to provide amendments can be done by Order in Council, and the Prime Minister stated that some matters that were brought to his attention to-day, and other matters, were being considered by the Government. Hon. gentlemen will admit that with this House continuously in session, and ministers busy here all day and up to late at night, it was impossible to take many things that were urgent.

Mr. MACDONALD: You are the only minister who does any work.

Mr. REID: No. they have all been working very hard. This question will be taken up and dealt with and we will carry the matter along until Parliament meets again. The hon. gentleman speaks of what the United States have done in the short time since they have been at war. He knows that when this war came on there was no preparation. We had to initiate everything and get the organization started. The United States knew this war was going on and they were getting ready for the war that they would eventually get into. They have had the advantage of our experience and of that of other nations. I believe that the Government and people of this country have done more in this war than the Government and people of any other country in the world. I do not take second place to any country or government. The people and Government of Canada have done

everything possible to further their participation in the war. The question of an increase in the pensions is being considered and an increase will be given. The present rate of pensions was unanimously agreed to by the members of this House and now all agree that the question of the rate of pensions should again be considered. The Government are considering the matter and will come to a conclusion as to an increase in the pension. When we meet again the House will be in a position to reconsider and readjust the whole matter. A matter of this kind is very important to the men at the front, to those whom they have left behind and to the people of the country as a whole. Criticism with regard to it is good. While the criticism of my hon. friend from Pictou (Mr. Macdonald) is very severe, we are still glad to have it. This criticism will result in good and we will consider the different suggestions which have been made.

9 p.m

I was surprised to hear my hon. friend from Edmonton (Mr. Oliver) say that there was a possibility that he might not return. We all like to have him here.

Mr. OLIVER: I presume that is why my hon. friend insists on putting through the Military Voters' Bill and the War-Time Elections Bill.

Mr. SINCLAIR: I am in thorough sympathy with this vote and I do not wish for a moment to delay its passage. But the minister slid over one or two questions that I did think he ought to have dealt with. On two or three occasions the question of insuring the lives of soldiers was brought up by speakers, and I do not think that the minister has given any answer on that question. It is a matter of the very greatest importance, and if it is true that the insurance companies have refused altogether to accept risks on the men who are liable to be called out, then it is a question upon which the Government ought to take some action. I recollect that at the time of the South African war, the late Right Hon. Sir Charles Tupper proposed a scheme by which the lives of the soldiers were to be protected by life insurance. I do not think his scheme was ever carried out, but I remember that he advocated it. I have seen in the press that in the United States the premium of insurance on a soldier is very low. Something like $3.50 or $4 a month for $5,000 is what is being paid by soldiers who have been recruited under the new Military Service Bill of the United States. I have no doubt that some arrangements have been made by the Government of the United States with the insurance companies by which they are protected financially. Why is it that our Government have not done something? Is it not of the greatest importance that the men who can afford to pay life insurance should have an opportunity of insuring their lives before they are drafted? I join with my hon. friend from Pictou (Mr. Macdonald) in condemning the Government for having allowed this question of pensions to lie over since the 11th of June without having dealt with it. Why did they not deal with it? Surely they have had time enough to take this question up since the 11th of June. Look at the resolution placed on the Order Paper by the hon. the Minister of Finance (Sir Thomas White). I think the Minister of Customs (Mr. Reid) was a little astray in what he told us to-night. He explained that this proposal was simply for the purpose of appointing a commission and of making certain regulations governing the commission, but that it did not give them any power to deal with the question of pensions. If he looks at the proposal on the Order Paper he will find that he is altogether mistaken in regard to the effect of it. This is the proposal:

> Resolved, that it is expedient to establish a Commission to be known as "The Board of Pension Commissioners for Canada," consisting of three Commissioners, and to provide for salaries and expenses in connection therewith, and to empower the Board to award pensions, allowances, and gratuities to any persons who have served in the military or naval expeditionary forces of Canada during the present war and have been disabled on such service, and to their children; and to the widows, children and dependents of such persons when death occurs during or was due to such service; the said pensions, allowances and gratuities to be paid out of moneys appropriated by Parliament for the purpose.

You will see that the resolution deals not only with the appointment of a pension commission, but with the whole question of pensions. There is no doubt that the Government deserves to be condemned for neglecting this important matter all through last summer. It should have been dealt with. There are a number of other things in connection with the military affairs of this country on which the Government has fallen down and with which it has not dealt. It has fallen down on the question of national service; on the question of recruiting; on the question of raising the soldiers' pay—which has been brought up in the

House a number of times—on the question of pensions, and has devoted all its time for the last few months to schemes of a very low order, tampering with the franchise, as any one can see by the measure now being forced through the Senate. The Government has had plenty of time to attend to questions of that kind, but apparently not time to attend to important questions in relation to our military forces, which should have been attended to. What has the minister to say about the insurance policies?

Mr. REID: The hon. member for Edmonton raised the insurance question this afternoon. He referred to the fact that it had been brought to the attention of the Government and the Prime Minister informed him that the whole matter would be taken into consideration.

Mr. COPP: It seems to me a regrettable fact that great hardships have arisen, and will arise in the future, in regard to pensions, unless the Government takes steps to put the law on a better basis. I have at this moment received an answer to an application for a pension from a widow in my county. The case seems to me a very hard one indeed. As the hon. member for Pictou was speaking I was reading the letter I received from the Board of Pension Commissioners refusing the application for the pension. The situation is this: Some fifteen years ago this woman was left a widow with six young children. She had a small farm and kept her family together until they grew up. One married, and two sons were left at home. One enlisted and went to the front, returned and was discharged. After he recovered his health he re-enlisted and went overseas the second time. He had been there only a few months when he was killed. The eldest son is at home working the farm, but he may leave at any time and get married, or anything may happen to him, and if anything happens, this widow will be absolutely alone. The board refused the pension, and they were probably right according to law. I have no fault to find with the Board of Pension Commissioners, I have had occasion to go to the board during the last two or three years and have been treated with the greatest courtesy, and I think they would do the best they could under the circumstances. The answer I have received from them to-night is that the law reads "wholly or mainly dependent upon;" and, they cannot get around that point. They practically admit, although they do not say it in so many words, that it is a hardship. Reading between the lines, I would say they consider the case one in which relief should be given. This woman is poor. Her son has given his life in defence of his country. And now, because of some words in the law, the commissioners are debarred from considering the question of granting the pension which she deserves, and which I am sure the commissioners think she deserves. If such is the law—and I presume it is—it is very unfortunate that Parliament is to be prorogued without placing upon the statute-book a law giving greater latitude to the commissioners, permitting them to investigate each particular case, and deal with each case on its merits. This case, I am sure, deserves the greatest consideration. I understand the Minister of Customs, who has charge of these estimates, to state that while no law is being passed this year to amend the Pensions Act, these cases will be provided for by Order in Council. I sincerely trust such an Order may be passed as will give relief in this and other cases on the same footing.

Pensions payable to militiamen and on active service as follows: Northwest Rebellion, 1885, $14,000; general, $30,000.

Mr. REID: The hon. member for Edmonton wanted a list of those receiving pensions under the item "Northwest Rebellion, 1885."

Mr. OLIVER: No, I did not wish for that. All I wanted was to know how it came that we were voting this particular sum of money for the Northwest rebellion.

Mr. REID: We pay it every year to the Northwest Rebellion veterans.

Mr. OLIVER: Is it not different from the item last year?

Mr. REID: No, it is the old item. We have it every year. The whole list is in the Auditor General's Report. The question was as to the militia pensions generally.

Mr. OLIVER: I understood the minister to say that part of this money was for the Home Defence, or Home Guard Service. I desire a fuller explanation in regard to that. Besides, there is an increase of $24,000 since last year. That is what particularly claimed my attention.

Mr. REID: The hon. gentleman will remember the letter I read from the Militia Department, in which it was said that the increase was on account of men on the

Home Defence. There is one general pension account as it were. On account of the large number of men serving in the Home Defence force, the pension list is increasing. For instance, a member of the Home Defence force, while guarding one of the locks, was killed through no fault of his own. His case would come under the Militia Act.

Mr. OLIVER: The item shows an increase of $24,000, which, I assume, is entirely in respect of pensions on account of disability during service in the home defence force. The size or extent of the home defence force, the circumstances under which it is maintained, and the kind of service it renders, are things which are not generally known. What are the circumstances that call for this extra payment of pensions? Is the scale of pensions in this case the same as that provided in the case of overseas service, or is it the old scale that prevailed some years ago?

Mr. NICKLE: The old scale.

Mr. REID: Militia pensions generally are for all those in the militia engaged in active service, but not overseas. A great number of men have been employed in guarding canals, elevators, railways, bridges, public buildings, and so on. Accidents are bound to occur among these men, and the pension list accordingly increases. These pensions are dealt with as they have been for some years, by the Militia Council on the old scale. I think that a return was brought down giving the information asked for by my hon. friend up to a certain date. The only information that it would be necessary for me to furnish in response to his request is that covering the period since the bringing down of that return.

Mr. OLIVER: I do not insist upon that. But what I find strange is that in this home defence force there should be an increase in one year of $24,000 for pensions. The war has been going on for three years, and it is rather unaccountable that there should be a fourfold increase during the year.

Mr. REID: That is information that the hon. gentleman should have. The letter that I read this afternoon from the Paymaster General gave the estimate of the amount required during the fiscal year. Of course, the whole of the amount may not be used, but it is necessary to provide an amount to cover all possible requirements.

Mr. MACDONALD: My hon. friend told us this afternoon that this vote was for pensioners under the Militia Act. The pensioners we have under the Militia Act are officers.

Mr. REID: No.

Mr. MACDONALD: Very largely. I know some officers at headquarters who have been pensioned under the Militia Act.

Mr. REID: The hon. member is wrong when he says that only officers are pensioned under the Militia Act. Under the Pay and Allowance regulations which took effect September 1, 1914, it was provided as follows:

> The following rates of pensions will be granted militiamen wounded or disabled on active service, during drill or training, or on other military duty, provided the disability was not due to his own fault or negligence.

These regulations provide for pensions to men of the first, second, third and fourth degrees, of the following ranks: rank and file; sergeant; squad, battery or company or sergeant-major; squad, battery, or company quartermaster-sergeant; colour sergeant; staff sergeant; regimental sergeant-major; master gunner; regimental quartermaster-sergeant; warrant officer—

Mr. MACDONALD: Those are members of the permanent force?

Mr. REID: No, those are all on active service, and as I have stated, there are many men on home service in this country.

Mr. MACDONALD: How many?

Mr. REID: I do not know, but the return, up to a certain date, has been brought down. I have not the later information. If my hon. friend desires it, I will write to the department for the information.

Mr. OLIVER: All we want to know is how this very remarkable increase in the estimates, in regard to this particular item, comes about. We really ought to have that information because the increase is a very startling one. While I would not wish to be too suspicious, when we see the figures of the estimates performing such startling gymnastics, we necessarily become suspicious.

Mr. REID: The hon. member, of course, knows the way in which these pensions to men on active service are dealt with. Every claim for a pension by a militiaman must come before the Militia Council and be passed by them. The Militia Council make a recommandation to Council. The matter then goes before the Treasury Board which

must examine and pass upon the pension, and then it goes before Council in which the matter is taken up. The hon. member, therefore, from his own experience in regard to these matters, will, I think, agree with me that there is not much opportunity for money being improperly expended. I feel, of course, as the Paymaster General has stated, that he has put in an amount that he would be sure would cover any amount that would be required for any one injured on active service. This includes not only the regular active militia, but the extra men who have been put on or enlisted in the active militia for home guard duty.

Mr. MACDONALD: Why does the minister not put the whole of the pensions under the one control? There is no use in having these side pensions administered in this way. There is no reason why they should not be transferred by Order in Council.

Mr. REID: These pensions are, as I have stated, administered by the Militia Council, but they are all paid through the Pensions Board.

Mr. MACDONALD: Why should they not be altogether under the Pensions Board?

Mr. REID: That matter will probably be taken up later on. That raises the whole question of pensions, and I cannot answer as to the question of policy.

Mr. NICKLE: I think I can clear up the matter. The report of the special committee of last year dealt with the question of pensions for members of the Canadian Expeditionary Force. The committee recommended, as the hon. member for Pictou (Mr. Macdonald) will remember, that a commission be appointed to take charge of and administer that particular branch of the pension work. The militia pensions to which the hon. member refers are not pensions to officers who have retired after long service, but are pensions paid to members of the militia in Canada, such as the home guard, who suffer disability. The hon. gentleman will remember that, when the documents were referred to the committee of last session, there was in effect a scheme of pensions by which $264 was granted to members of the rank and file. That scheme of pensions was not affected by the report of the committee in so far as it affected the members of the Canadian Defence Force, the Home Guard, and so on. The report of the committee dealt only with the members of the Canadian Expeditionary Force. As I understand the practice at the present time, the Pensions and Claims Board of the Militia Department determine what pensions shall be paid to members of the Canadian militia, and the payment is then made through the Pensions Board. The whole matter as to the centralization under the one commission rests until legislation is introduced in this House. But the pensions to officers are commonly known as the pensions under the Act of 1901, that is, pensions for long service.

Mr. MACDONALD: Are those voted separately, or are they included in the general vote?

Mr. NICKLE: They are voted separately, I understand.

Mr. MACDONALD: Will the minister arrange to give us to-morrow a list of the parties who are receiving pensions under this vote?

Mr. REID: Yes.

Penitentiaries—To provide a further amount necessary in consequence of the error in item No. 414 of the Supplementary Estimates, for a bonus not exceeding $100 each to penitentiary officials and employees whose salary was $1,000 or less on April 1, 1917, $6,000.

Mr. MACDONALD: Did not this item stand for some information?

Mr. NICKLE: This item was put in to cover an error in the original estimate. Provision was made for the payment of a bonus of $100 to those whose salaries were $1,000 or less. There were in the penitentiaries about 60 industrial guards who were left out of the count in the estimate, and this is simply to cover an error in the computation.

Mr. COPP: Does that apply to all the penitentiaries in the Dominion?

Mr. NICKLE: It is general in its application.

Mr. EDWARDS: I did not happen to be here when the item amounting to $26,500 of which this is a part, was taken up. I am not opposing the increase or bonus of $100 to those guards, although I see no reason why it should be limited to the guards and should not be given to the men on the clerical staff. If you simply regard this matter from the standpoint of the amount of salary paid to the guards in the penitentiaries, you will not be considering it as it should be considered.

In addition to the salary of $800 or $900, as the case may be, every guard receives two suits of clothes, an overcoat, cap, boots, and so on. He is allowed two weeks' holi-

days during the year, and a gratuity is provided for which is equivalent to the Government keeping insurance in force, so to speak, to an amount anywhere from $1,200 to $1,800, according to the length of time the guard has served and the salary he has received. For instance, a man drawing $75 a month who had served twenty years would draw on retirement a lump sum of $1,500. Frequently, men have retired and drawn that amount, and then gone into some other occupation.

Mr. NESBITT: Do they pay anything towards it?

Mr. EDWARDS: Nothing whatever. I have in mind the case of a guard who, upon retirement at his own request, drew a gratuity of $1,200 or $1,500—I forget just which—and was afterwards taken on the staff, although he had been retired. There is really supposed to be only one reason for a man retiring, and that is physical or mental unfitness for his position. One would naturally suppose, therefore, that if a man retired on account of physical or mental unfitness and drew a gratuity, he would not be replaced on the staff, but there was at least one case where that occurred, and the man is on the staff at the present time. I do not think the principle of giving a gratuity to the guard is a right one. I think their salaries ought to be regulated in some such way as the salaries of civil servants. Giving a gratuity to a man makes him a slave to his superior officers. Under those conditions a man is afraid to express an opinion lest he incur the displeasure of his superior officer, who might report him in such a way that it would be impossible for him to obtain a gratuity, or perhaps compel him to retire on grounds other than those of ill-health and thereby lose the gratuity which he had earned during his years of service. It does seem to me that the logical and reasonable thing to do would be to fix a minimum salary and then allow a certain amount for good conduct, and let the salary advance to certain maximum. There would then be an incentive to a man to do his best. He would get paid as he went along, and when he retired he need receive no gratuity or pension of any kind. When this matter was under discussion before, the Minister of Justice referred to the case of a man who had been employed for a great many years in one of our western institutions, and who died very suddenly of heart disease. Dying suddenly in that way, without any opportunity of putting in a claim for a gratuity, there was nothing coming to his family, notwithstanding the fact that this man had served for thirty-two years. As the Minister of Justice pointed out, that was a case of extreme hardship. The man's family did not have anything to live on, and there was no gratuity coming to them because the man had not retired on account of illness. But if twenty-four hours before his death, he had made up his mind to retire, and had made application accordingly on the ground of ill-health, he would have drawn $1,700 or $1,800. But, being suddenly stricken with heart disease, there was nothing coming to him, unless the government granted a compassionate allowance. The case was dealt with in that way, and very properly, by Parliament. That case seems to me to prove conclusively that the present system is asolutely illogical and unfair.

I know of a case where a man by the name of Young, who had been a guard for many years, was taken ill. He did not send in his resignation or apply for his retiring allowance because he expected to get better and return to his work. He withheld sending in the necessary papers to Ottawa until just a few hours too late. The man died. The papers did not get here in time, and his family was deprived of an amount which they would have obtained if the papers had arrived here a few minutes sooner.

Mr. NESBITT: On what basis are gratuities granted? Is so much counted for every year's service?

Mr. EDWARDS: Supposing a man's salary during the past three years had averaged $75 a month, and he had been employed as a guard for twenty years. Upon retiring he would receive one month's salary for every year he had served; that is, twenty times $75, or $1,500. I think I have stated it correctly.

Mr. DOHERTY: Yes.

Mr. NESBITT: But if he dies, his family gets nothing?

Mr. EDWARDS: Absolutely nothing, unless the Government grants a compassionate allowance, as they did in a case last week. Speaking on that case the Minister of Justice said: "On inquiry I find that it is most unlikely that other cases of a similar kind would occur; so that this will not be establishing a precedent." That simply means that the Minister of Justice is under the impression that there will not

be any more guards die of heart disease and thereby be excluded from obtaining the pension they would have received if they had retired in the ordinary way.

Mr. NESBITT: You cannot tell that.

Mr. EDWARDS: No, I don't think so. However, to return to the matter of the guards and their salaries. In addition to their salaries they get these articles of clothing which I have mentioned, and that is not all. I think I am right in saying that when they are on duty at the prison they have to take some of their meals there. These meals they get at about twelve and a half or thirteen cents each. They also get a great many things from the prison at a much lower price than ordinary people can get them elsewhere. For instance, most excellent bread is made at the prisons, and all the guards have to do is to put in a requisition for whatever bread they want for themselves and their families, and they get it at several cents a loaf less than the ordinary citizen has to pay. This provision for gratuity is equivalent to a paid-up insurance policy. Taking all these things into consideration, I do not think I am extravagant in saying that you are adding $150 a year to their salaries in the way of these perquisites. The work they perform is not heavy work. True, there is a certain element of danger connected with it, but it is not work which requires very great education, and the salaries of these men are as good as if not better than the salaries of the clerical staff. There are hundreds of employees in the various branches of the public service whose hours are very much longer than those of the penitentiary guards, and whose work is very much more particular, yet they are receiving less salary than those men. It is said this is not an increase in salary, but simply a bonus granted because of the high cost of living at the present time. We may call it a bonus for the time being, but I am satisfied that once they receive this grant it will be very hard to cut it off. The probabilities are that it will never be cut off. I do not wish to be understood as being opposed to the granting of this $100 to them, but I think consideration should also be given to the clerical staff who, in my judgment, are not overpaid.

There are one or two other matters in connection with the penitentiaries to which I would like to call attention. In the first place there is the lack of suitable prison employments. This was referred to by Mr. Douglas Stewart, Inspector of Penitentiaries, in his reports. He states that this is one of the principal difficulties with which the penitentiary officials have to contend. I think that difficulty could be largely removed by making use of the services of prisoners to produce many articles which are required in our Government buildings throughout the country, articles of furniture, for instance, and for the manufacture of rural mail boxes, as well as a hundred and one other things that could be mentioned. I know this suggestion will be met with the old song that we are "competing with free labour." But this is a State institution, maintained at the expense of the State, and the State should have a right to make use of the services of these men to produce such articles as it may require. Some departure has been made from the ordinary routine during the last two or three years. We have made use of prison labour to a certain extent in improving the roads around Kingston. Might I impress upon the minister that I think the convict labour of the Kingston penitentiary might very well be used in rebuilding the piece of road which was taken over by the late Government from Cataraqui bridge up through the military camp. The Government has to maintain this piece of road, and I see no reason why the prisoners could not be employed in maintaining it. There is any amount of material there, but men are scarce. I do not know how this will be received by the minister, but I recommend it to his careful consideration.

One of the principal causes of trouble in our penitentiaries at the present time is that the men are not allowed to have tobacco. They get it in an underhand way, and there has been a good deal of difficulty on that account. Guards have been charged with taking money for conveying tobacco to the prisoners. I think one of the best means of putting an end to that trouble would be to allow the convicts a limited supply of tobacco. However, that is a matter upon which opinions may very widely differ.

Many years ago Sir John Thompson proposed erecting a penal institution to take care of youthful convicts under twenty years of age. That movement ended with Sir John Thompson's death. I think it is a matter that we might very seriously consider. I notice by the last prison statistics that we have, those for the year ended March 31, 1915, that 187 convicts twenty years of age and under are in our various penal institutions. Some of these might have been serving a second or third term

but I think it very unlikely. I would assume that most of them were in for the first time. I do think that these young men can hardly be expected to leave those institutions any better than when they went in. Suppose they are first offenders, they are brought into contact with old criminals, men who have spent a good part of their lives behind prison walls. I do not think we are giving these young fellows a square deal, a fair show. The object of imprisonment is twofold. A man must be taught that he must expect to be punished if he violates the laws of the land. But surely that is not the sole and only object of sending him to prison. It may be the first thing to consider, but we should also consider the possibility of turning that man out at the expiration of his sentence with the prospect of becoming a good and useful citizen. If young lads twenty years of age and under could be sent to a separate institution, located somewhere between Kingston and Montreal, and kept by themselves, there would be a better chance of their becoming useful citizens than there is when they are housed with men of all classes as they are at the present time. In that connection, it is very interesting to note that in the Kingston penitentiary 3.7 per cent of the convicts were less than twenty or only 21 out of a total population of 559. At St. Vincent de Paul there were 72 out of a population of 447—over 16 per cent—were under twenty years of age. Dorchester about 14½ per cent of the population was under twenty; in Manitoba 12½ per cent and in British Columbia, Alberta and Saskatchewan between 5 and 6 per cent. I am not going to undertake to give a reason for that; I frankly admit I cannot give a reason. But the figures arrested my attention. I could not help but note such a large percentage in St. Vincent de Paul and Dorchester penitentiaries—16 and 14½ per cent as compared with 3.7 per cent at Kingston. That is something for which there may be an explanation but it does not occur to me. The percentage of convicts in various institutions who are put down as intemperate is also worth noting. In this connection Alberta has the best record, less than three per cent of its prison population being put down as intemperate, while at St. Vincent de Paul the number is 48½ per cent, Kingston, 37½ per cent; Manitoba, 40 per cent, and British Columbia 6·8 per cent. I am told that since the passing of prohibition in Ontario and in other provinces where prohibitory measures have been passed, a very marked effect has been noticeable upon the prison population, that it is much less than formerly. The lessened number of convicts is attributed to a very large extent to the difficulty people have at the present time in getting liquor. I think possibly that is true.

10 p.m.

If I might refer again to the matter which is uppermost in my mind in connection with our penal institutions, I would like to impress upon the Minister of Justice and the members of this House the importance of seriously considering the erection of a separate institution for boys under twenty or twenty-one years of age who are first offenders. I honestly believe that such an institution will more than pay for itself, even if you consider only the matter of dollars and cents. But if you estimate its value upon other lines, the possible reclamation of young men who may become useful citizens, it is impossible to state in terms of money its value to the country. We ought to do all that we possibly can as representatives of the people to reclaim any of those fellows where it is possible to reclaim them. I do not think that there is any man entirely so bad that there is no good in him, and perhaps we might turn that around and say that there is no man so good but there is some bad in him. I think there is some good in every man, and you will get it out of him if you go the right way about it. I do not think that a boy who is sent to prison for the first time has a fair show to come out of that institution and become a useful member of society, having to mix, as he does, with criminals of all classes. I believe that as men who are interested in our fellow men we ought seriously to consider, as Sir John Thompson did, the erection of such an institution as I have mentioned to take care of the young men who are found in our various penal institutions. That is the main reason why I rose to speak to-night. I sincerely ask the members of this House to give the matter consideration.

Mr. NESBITT: I certainly think a great many of my hon. friend's remarks are very timely, and I rise to endorse what he has said in regard to separate institutions, such as the prison farm, where the younger men who are not steeped in crime can be given employment. The theory of the present day in reference to prisons is that they are just as much for reformation as for punishment. They have made a marked success at Sing Sing along that line, and certainly

nothing could be more successful than the efforts of the Hon. Mr. Hanna in establishing a prison farm at Guelph. He has had wonderful success in reforming a great many men who were sent to prison. My hon. friend's remarks along that line are very much to the point, and I think the minister will give them serious consideration.

I desire to ask the minister whether the men working at the penitentiary are paid anything? In many institutions they pay the prisoners a certain amount for their work, and when they go out into the world they are not entirely destitute. I understand they give them a suit of clothes when they leave the penitentiary. Advocates of prison reform in the United States lay great stress on the advisability of paying the men something so as to give them a start in the world when they are discharged. Is there any system of that kind in Canada?

Mr. DOHERTY: At present the convict is not paid anything for his work.

Mr. NICKLE: I cannot say whether or not the committee has been particularly impressed with what the hon. member for Frontenac has said with reference to wages paid the guards and employees of the Kingston penitentiary. While certainly he did not criticise these employees in so many words, I do not think I would be outside the mark in saying that he almost damned them with faint praise. With reference to the remuneration paid to a man for services, it makes a great deal of difference from what angle you view the subject, and I am rather inclined to think that the hon. gentleman from Frontenac viewed this matter from the point of view of the man who lives in the country, rather than the point of view of the city man. The ordinary guard in the Kingston penitentiary—and I think, similarly, in other penitentiaries in Canada —receives $800 a year. He has to work 365 days and loses practically part of each Sunday. He gets two suits of clothes, a pair of boots, a hat, and other perquisites, and is allowed to take advantage of the bakery and buy bread at cost. When you consider what it costs to live in Canada today, and what the industrial workers outside are getting, I do not think any member of this committee will contend that a man receiving $900 a year—as that is the remuneration of the guard, with $100 added —is being exorbitantly paid for his services. We must have regard from the point of view of the work these men have to undertake. It is a position of great trust, in which a man, if he is dishonest, can make a great deal of money by trafficking with the convicts. You expect honesty and efficiency, and you expect the guard to keep himself neat and tidy when off duty. Last autumn or early last spring a delegation of the guards came to my house, and some of them explained to me that, living as they could, they were going behind $4 or $5 a month, without meeting clothing expenses of their family or doctor's expenses. I regret, as well as the hon. member for Frontenac, that the clerical staff has not had an increase. They are doing their work well, and many of them are not paid adequately for their services, but the Government laid down the principle that no man in receipt of more than $1,000 salary should receive the bonus, and those on the clerical staff, being all paid in excess of $1,000, could not take advantage of the regulation. The vote is not limited strictly to the industrial guards, but it is limited to those whose salary does not exceed $1,000. The hon. member for Frontenac has said in one breath that the gratuity system practically amounted to an insurance policy, and in the next breath admitted that it was not an insurance or superannuation, but a gratuity paid to a man, for years of service, who does not resign, but is relieved from service, the man's conduct having been good. If a man dies in the employ of the penitentiary no superannuation is paid to his wife. If he resigns he gets nothing; he severs his connection with the penitentiary, and gets what is coming to him, and that ends it. If he dies in the ordinary course of human affairs, nothing is paid to his widow. It is not an insurance. The Government simply says to the penitentiary guard: "If you do your duty faithfully and well, and if you live beyond the allotted span of life, and become so worn out in the Government service that you are not fit to continue the performance of your duties, then we will give you a gratuity, something to live on, in your declining days. But this provision cannot be taken advantage of by the wife or family of the guard.

I might say—and I think the hon. member for Frontenac will bear me out—that this year the convicts of the Kingston penitentiary have done more than usual of constructive work. They have built a magnificent roadway in front of the penitentiary proper, and partially in the village that lies to the west of the penitentiary. They have done more farm work than usual, because

the cry for increased production made available land that did not belong to the penitentiary, but which was placed at the Government's disposal by the owners, so that a crop might be raised on it this year. I think I am safe in saying that more work has been done this year than in former years. But when it comes to the question of turning the convicts over to work in gangs on general road construction, I think the hon. member for Frontenac and I do not see eye to eye. In my judgment the work for the convict should be work of a constructive character, from the point of view of the upbuilding of the convict, the development of habits in him that would be useful; and he should learn a trade. Then, when he leaves the institution, he could turn his knowledge to advantage. I may not be right in my conclusion, but I think that many men return to the penitentiary after having left it because they are not able to earn a decent living outside. I have always thought that if a man left there instructed in a trade so that he could earn a living, he would not drift back into the penitentiary. But if we are going to make it an industrial drudgery, the man is no better when he leaves than when he went into the institution. My idea is that the great work in which these men should be instructed is agriculture. The cry from one end of the country to the other is for assistance on the farm. If, after the war is over and things are more or less settled, the Minister of Justice could see his way to buy large tracts of land adjacent to the several penitentiaries and give the men instructions in scientific agriculture, I think he would take a long step towards solving our penitentiary problems. Many men, if they were instructed as agricultural labourers, would leave the cities and go into the country. They would be in a new environment; they would be removed from their old haunts and from the temptations to which they had previously been subjected. I sincerely trust that this matter will not escape the attention of the Minister of Justice. With regard to tobacco, some people may say that it is a luxury. I have talked with many inmates of penitentiaries, and I know that many of them get tobacco against the rules. It is sent in to them; there is a certain amount of traffic in it. If the men are going to get it; if they are willing to break the rules to obtain it, it seems to me that it would not be unwise for the Government to make some provision by which the men could get a definite allowance of tobacco as a reward for good conduct and faithfulness or service. Some of the men tell me that the withholding of tobacco from them is a terrible deprivation. The cost of supplying tobacco would not be excessive, and I think the advantage would be great.

When you come to the youthful offender, you are face to face with a mighty problem. Those who profess to speak with confidence on the subject of the criminal say that the youth of the criminal does not always indicate the enormity of the offence; that some of the worst men in the penitentiaries are those serving their first terms; that some of these are the most abandoned of the immates of the penitentiaries. I do not believe that you can make your line of segregation on the basis of age. If there is to be segregation, the less hardened of the criminals should be removed to an institution where they will not be subjected to the contaminating influences of what are called hardened criminals. I should like to see something done along the line of education. So many of these young boys that drift into the penitentiaries hardly know how to read or write; some cannot even sign their own names. It does seem almost a crime that young fellows sixteen, seventeen and eighteen years of age are incarcerated for three or four years during the constructive and acquiring period of their lives, and then turned out at the expiration of their term no better than they were when they went in. I agree with the member for North Oxford (Mr. Nesbitt) that the object of our penitentiary system should be punitive; but it should be reformative as well. I sincerely trust that when the opportunity arises the Minister of Justice will give his attention to the problems that I know he realizes must be solved, and will endeavour to do something to better the conditions of the criminal population of our country.

Mr. EDWARDS: I repeat that I am not opposed to the granting of this bonus to the guards. I pointed out, however, that their pay, generally speaking, was better than the pay of many men in other branches of the service who had longer hours and greater responsibility. To that statement, which has a bearing upon the question of salary, or bonus to these men, the member for Kingston did not take any exception, although he came to the conclusion that I was opposed to the granting of an increase

to the guards of the institution. That, of course, will go on record, and I trust that it will bring to him the reward that he expects it will. Of course I am not responsible for what the hon. gentleman thought; Hansard will show what I said.

In the matter of gratuities, I should have thought that a gentleman so well posted in these matters as the member for Kingston would have been more familiar with the subject with which he was dealing. He said that this gratuity was given not to those who voluntarily resigned their positions, but only to those who resigned on account of illness, who had reached old age in the service, or whose condition of health compelled them to retire. My hon. friend is entirely in error in that, because gratuities have been given in more than one case to guards who resigned not on account of ill-health. The Minister of Justice will bear me out in that assertion.

Mr. NICKLE: Of course, I did not profess to cover every class. I understand that gratuities are at times granted when guards are permitted to resign to promote efficiency.

Mr. EDWARDS: My hon. friend is now giving us a supplement to his former statement. Of course, I can only take his remarks as he gave them. My point is that his former statement is entirely incorrect

Mr. NICKLE: Partially.

Mr. EDWARDS: No, entirely incorrect. He said that this gratuity was not given to guards who voluntarily resigned their positions.

Mr. NICKLE: I say that yet.

Mr. EDWARDS: I am in a position to state that that is incorrect. During the present year guards who have resigned not because of ill health or decrepitude have applied for gratuity and have received it. I can give the names if necessary. I am more than pleased that the member for Kingston, who has given this matter a great deal of study, has agreed with one or two of the assertions that I made. It is a satisfaction and an encouragement to me that he agrees with me in the matter of supplying tobacco to the convicts. I was sorry that he did not see fit to express a definite opinion in regard to the employment of convicts in work for the State, in the making of furniture and other things in general use in various departments of the Government. There is nothing in the breaking of stone to improve the mental, moral or physical condition of the convict. That has been going on as far back as I can remember; the practice still prevails in all these institutions. I do not agree that it would be wise to get agricultural employment for all the convicts, because many of them are unsuited to agricultural work. Many of them are mechanically inclined. There is a farm connected with each of these institutions which I think, will give employment to most of those among the convicts who are suited to that kind of work and who can be benefited by engaging in it. Hundreds of convicts could be employed in learning trades, making furniture, manufacturing things which the State must buy in large quantities, such as rural mail boxes, and the like. It is only necessary to visit one of these institutions and observe the difference between the convicts employed on the stone piles and those employed at making brooms or some other kind of work to realize the great benefit that is to be derived from utilizing the convicts in some constructive employment. Work on roads is very useful; it is work in the open; the convict has something to show for his labour and something to look forward to. Various penal institutions on the other side of the line recognize the benefit of engaging these men to work on the roads. I understand that the convicts are often taken many miles from the gates of the prison in order that they may be employed in this way. I mentioned that piece of road near Barriefield camp because it is a government road. It is a road which has been taken over by the Dominion Government and which has to be maintained by the Dominion Government, and when prison labour could easily be employed it is reasonable that it should be employed in maintaining a piece of property owned by this Government.

To the other and main point to which I referred, the hon. member for Kingston (Mr. Nickle) did not give his attention, that is, the building of an institution for the care of boys of 21 years of age who are first offenders, and I would like to have an expression of opinion on that point from the Minister of Justice.

Mr. DOHERTY: Different matters have been touched upon, and perhaps I might say just a word or two with regard to them. I shall be very glad to express to the committee the opinion I hold with regard to providing means whereby certain institu-

tions might be created for different classes of offenders, and I shall deal with that after I have said a few words about other matters that have been mentioned. With regard to the question of gratuities and its bearing upon the particular case in which a compassionate allowance was granted, I would like to point out that in no department of the Civil Service is there provision made for compensation to surviving relatives of employees. In some of the departments, with regard to older civil servants, who were in the employment of the Government when the superannuation system was in force, there is provision for superannuation, but that does not survive the recipient of it. The penitentiaries, therefore, are not in a different position with regard to the granting of compensation to the surviving relatives of servants who have died in their employ from the other departments of Government. The committee will realize that it would be a large proposition, which would call for careful consideration by this Government, to undertake to make provision for surviving relatives of its employees. Much might be said in favour of that plan, but I do not see that anything special might be said in favour of it so far as the employees of penitentiaries are concerned. The gratuity is intended as an allowance for a man who serves either for a lengthy period until he is broken down, or whose employment in the penitentiary is terminated otherwise than by fault of his own. There are cases in which men resign because they become incapacitated, and it is usual in such cases to grant a gratuity. There are also cases in which it is considered that it tends to promote the efficiency of the institution that a man should be retired or allowed to resign, and in such cases the gratuity is paid to him. But so far as there is any connection between the granting of the compassionate allowance, granted to Mrs. Mackenzie in the supplementary estimates, and the question of gratuities, I have only to point out that to make any grant to the surviving dependents, we have to depart from the rule that prevails throughout the Civil Service. The special circumstances to which I referred when I said that I thought there was reason to believe that there would not be many absolutely similar cases was not an expression of opinion as to the liability of other men dying from heart disease. Mr. Mackenzie had a record of service that was absolutely exceptional in its length, as I am informed by the officers of the penitentiary, and there was in the second place this fact that played a large part in leading to the conclusion that the case should be treated as exceptional, that is to say, that his widow, with a large family of very small children, was left in absolutely destitute circumstances. I am also told that the case stood out rather as an exception, in that combination of conditions, with regard to what ordinarily happens in the case of a penitentiary vote. With regard to this particular allowance which is the matter properly before the committee, I have only to say that, in fixing the amount of it and the limit with regard to salaries to those who should be recipients of it, we have followed what has been done in the great number of departments of this Government, in view of the high cost of living. Some observations have been made with regard to the remuneration which those men already receive. That remuneration was fixed by Statute some years ago, Parliament at that time thinking it a proper remuneration for the services. If Parliament was right in that regard, then there must exist for those employees the same reason resting upon the increased cost of living that applies in the case of the employees of the Government generally. As to the limitation of $1,000, that, as I say, is following the rule. It has been pointed out that, in the supplementary estimates with regard to the post office, provision has been made for this allowance with regard to men of a certain class of employment who receive a salary up to $1,600. When we come to deal with that item, I think I shall be in a position to explain the reason of that particular disposition with regard to that particular department.

Something has been said with regard to the utilization of prison labour. I quite sympathise with the idea that we should utilize our prison labour to turn out a product that might be used by the Government and that might afford for the men in the penitentiaries more suitable occupation than sometimes we are able to put them to. It should, however, be remembered that it does not depend upon the Department of Justice to furnish things to people who do not want to take them from it. Before we can find our way to furnish those things, we shall have to find our market with the other departments of Government. It does not belong to me to criticise nor do I intend to do so, but we cannot supply that for which there is no demand. I have at different times, since I have had charge of the

administration of the penitentiaries, sought to find an outlet for penitentiary labour in furnishing the requirements of other departments. I regret to say I have not been successful. I do not want to criticise the reasons that were given. They were, in the judgment of those administering those departments, sufficient reasons, and I think at that particular time they were not open to criticism.

In that connection, referring to what the hon. member for North Oxford has said with regard to pay, if we were put in a position where the product of the labour of the convict could be disposed of to other departments of the Government, or in other directions that would not bring us into unfair competition with free labour, I myself would believe that it would be a perfectly proper thing that these things should be paid for by whomsoever they were acquired, and that out of those moneys there should be paid something to the convict to represent wages. In talking of wages or pay it has to be remembered that a convict is supported and clothed, but I think it would be most desirable, provided the moneys so paid to him for his labour were not necessary for the maintenance of those depending upon him while he was in the penitentiary—which is the first purpose to which it should be devoted—that when he went out he should have some savings to his credit. I certainly would welcome the day when it would be possible to bring about that condition of affairs. But it does not depend upon those responsible for the penitentiaries whether this is to be done or not. We cannot sell our product and get money for it until there are people ready to buy our product and pay for it. There have been certain periods, at the outbreak of this war for instance, when there was a serious lack of employment in the ordinary industries of the country, and apprehension of a greater lack of employment. At that time, at all events, it would hardly have seemed desirable to press for the initiation of a system of utilization of penitentiary labour. But we have done something towards the utilization of that labour in connection with the farming industry, and although I am not in a position to give details at the present moment, I may say that we have also utilized prison labour to a certain extent in the direction of providing things necessary in connection with the interned alien prisoners. I shall be glad, if it should become possible for us to find an outlet for the product of our labour, not only to give consideration to, but if the matter be in my hands, to endeavour to bring into practical operation, a system whereby more useful work may be done and whereby we may obtain the very desirable thing suggested by the hon. member for North Oxford. With regard to the separation of prisoners, I quite agree that it would be highly desirable to have a separation of the prisoners according to classes. I am not absolutely clear that it would have to be according to age, though I dare say you would find a larger proportion amongst the younger criminals who ought to be classified as among the less hardened criminals, than you would perhaps find among older men. I would rather classify with regard to the character of the criminal you are dealing with than absolutely on the line of age. I may say that before the outbreak of this war, in the year of 1914, I had given very considerable thought to this matter, and the plan that I had conceived, though not absolutely the plan suggested by the hon. member for Frontenac, was somewhat along the same line. My impression was, and still is, that the hardened criminal is in the minority, and my conception of what would be desirable to do, and what I should be glad to do if it should become possible and I have the opportunity, would be to provide say, two institutions in which the more hardened class of criminals should be confined, leaving the present institutions for what I believe to be the majority of the criminals we handle, that is, those who would not be described as hardened criminals. I think there would be advantage in preserving those less hardened from the injurious influence of association with those who are more hardened. In the second place, there would be to my mind this great advantage, that if you divide the institutions in that way it would make it possible to adopt what might be described as a milder rule for the institutions generally, reserving the more severe features of the rules as they are deemed necessary, for those institutions where the hardened criminals would be confined. Plans of that kind, of course, involve the starting out in new enterprise in the way of public works, and the expenditure of public money, and it was not considered desirable that we should embark upon new enterprises of that kind at that time to which I have referred. I do hope, however, that under better and more favourable circumstances we shall be able to obtain the result of a separation on the lines I have indicated, and I do hope that when we come to more normal times and condi-

tions it may be possible to persuade those who might properly be the customers of the penitentiary of the advisability of giving their custom to the penitentiary. When that time comes I shall certainly be glad to do what depends upon me, if I should be responsible for the administration of the institutions, to avail ourselves of that opportunity of giving a more varied employment.

Something has been said about road-making as a desirable form of employment. I think the hon. member will admit that we have done some little road-making during the past summer. As to the advantage or disadvantage, I may say that those who are experienced in the administration of penitentaries—I am not now expressing my own opinion—do not look upon it as desirable that the men should be called away to work at distances from the institution. While they sympathize with the desire for giving more suitable work, these experienced people do not seem to be of the opinion that road-making, outside of the immediate surroundings of the penitentiary would be a desirable thing.

Both hon. gentlemen have said something about tobacco, and I must admit that they touch what ought to be a very responsive chord in my own heart. The matter has been discussed from time to time with those responsible for the administration of the penitentiaries. What is said with regard to it —and I must say it has not quite convinced me that we ought not to allow tobacco— is that if you permit the use of tobacco for smoking purposes, that, of course involves the possession of matches and the possible danger of fire, which is an institution of that kind, no matter what you do to make it fireproof, is not to be overlooked. Such a thing in such an institution would be a disaster. Then, of course, it leaves open the practices of allowing tobacco to be chewed. Now it has been urged upon me that if we allow the use of tobacco it will be availed of, of course, by those who had contracted the habit before they went into the penitentiary, and in all probability by those who had not acquired the habit when they entered the penitentiary. It has been pressed upon me—I do not say it is a conclusive argument— that it would be a very undesirable thing if, among other habits, a young convict might acquire in a stay of two or three years in a penitentiary, would be the habit of chewing tobacco.

I do not want to say that personally I am specially scandalized by the suggestion, but there are people whose opinions are certainly entitled to very great respect, who would look upon that as a most objectionable thing. However, with regard to the question of tobacco, as I say, I am not convinced that it would not be desirable to permit its use, and I am not saying my last word upon the subject, if we can find a means which will satisfy those responsible for the administration that we are not creating inconveniences which would more than counterbalance the privation to which the men are now subject, and the more serious evil which is occasioned by the prohibition of tobacco, that is the trafficking between guards and prisoners.

Mr. OLIVER: How is the tobacco which is thus trafficked in used? Is it smoked or chewed?

Mr. DOHERTY: We have cases where men have been punished for smoking. We also have cases where men are found using tobacco for chewing purposes. Without pretending to speak with absolute certainty, my impression would be that it is used more for chewing than for smoking. One obvious reason is that the violation of the rule is less perfectly manifest if the tobacco is used for chewing. The convict has a better opportunity to avoid detection in the use of tobacco for chewing purposes.

Mr. OLIVER: If I understood the hon. member for Frontenac correctly, he is under the impression that this gratuity is an optional gratuity, that is, it is paid provided the authorities see fit, and withheld if the authorities do not see fit to pay it. Is that correct?

Mr. DOHERTY: It may be withheld if the man's course of conduct is considered to be such as would not entitle him to it. I may say, however, that, generally speaking, unless a man's connection with the penitentiary terminates either of his own perfect volition, when he is able to remain on, and when there is no reason to part with him, unless he has been guilty of conduct which is really reprehensible, it is usual to grant the gratuity. The man, however, may forfeit it by bad conduct.

Mr. OLIVER: I am speaking of the $100.

Mr. DOHERTY: This is an allowance to all the employees who have salaries of $1,000 and less. It is not optional.

Mr OLIVER: It is simply a temporary increase of salary without any option.

Mr DOHERTY: Yes.

Mr. OLIVER: I understand the argument of my hon. friend from Frontenac (Mr. Edwards) to be that being optional it placed the officer more dependent upon the favour of his superior than upon good service, whereas if he gets it as a straight increase in salary, of course he is still independent.

Mr. EDWARDS: Perhaps I did not make myself clear. I was not referring to this $100 at all. I was referring to the gratuity which is given to a man when he retires after serving, say, ten, or fifteen, or twenty years.

Mr. OLIVER: I misunderstood the application of my hon. friend's remarks. If this $100 we are voting now was optional, it would be objectionable. To my mind it should be a specific increase to every man's salary. There is a penitentiary in the constituency I represent, and I would like to say a word following the lines already taken up. In the case of the retiring gratuity to an officer of the penitentiary, I am strongly of the opinion that his family should get the benefit of that gratuity in the event of his death. The gratuity he earns by reason of long service is for the welfare and benefit of his family as well as for his personal advantage. That being so, when death overtakes him, say suddenly, his family is even more in distress and need than it otherwise would be, and I would certainly think it would be only fair and right, whatever may be the practice in the other departments of the Government, that in the penitentiary service, where the remuneration is not by any means too large, and where above everything reliability of service is required, the Government would be well advised to make a change and to give the family of the deceased officer the benefit of the gratuity to which he would be entitled upon retirement because of physical disability. I think the Minister may depend upon it that he would be supported by both sides of the House in such a proposal. In any event, I would be very glad to support him.

I was very favourably impressed by the suggestion of the Minister as to the employment of prisoners. Formerly a prison was simply a place of punishment, and the more undesirable the condition surrounding the inmates the more severe the punishment, and therefore the more fully the institution was fulfilling the purpose for which it was intended. Apparently, these views have given place to others, which have regard to the welfare of the prisoners, and a still further advance has been made in the public mind looking to the reformation of the inmates of the prisons. It seems to me there can be no reformation unless there is employment. Now, employment cannot produce reformation unless there is some reward for the employment. Employment without reward is slavery, and slavery is debasing, and whether it is inside walls or outside walls the result is bound to be the same. If we desire to use our penal institutions as a means of reformation, I cannoe see any objection to adopting the minister's idea that the inmates should be employed at a wage, which wage should either be made payable to the dependents of the inmates, or should be held to be given to the prisoners themselves when they are released. If the inmates of the penal institutions are producing for wages, there should not to be the same objection as has hitherto been urged that they are competing with free labour. True, they are competing with free labour, but the competition is on the same basis as that on which free labour is operating, that is to say, wages are paid for work done. That being so I do not see that there can be any reasonable objection to the product of that labour for which wages are paid being sold on the open market; certainly, not the same objection as prevails now—that the product of prison labour is in a different position from the product of free labour. Another feature of the case is that hitherto the dependent of the criminal suffers by reason of his punishment. That of course may be an increase of punishment to the criminal, who may suffer agony of mind because of the sufferings of his dependents.

To provide for payment to members of the Senate for days lost through absence in addition to the days for which no deduction is made under chap. 10, R.S.C., 1906, who during such absence were ill in hospitals, notwithstanding their being over ten miles from Ottawa, and to provide for the payment to members of the House of Commons for days lost through absence caused by illness, public business or on account of death, during the present session, including an amount of $2,500 to the Hon. H. S. Béland, a prisoner of war in Germany, and for days lost through absence not exceeding fifteen days, being in addition to the days for which no deduction is made under chap. 10, section 35, of the Revised Statutes of Canada, 1906, $55,000; to provide an amount for the Speaker of the House of Commons in lieu of residence and attendants, for the year ending 31st March, 1918, at the rate of $15 per diem—

further amount required, $1,800; to provide an amount for the Deputy Speaker of the House of Commons in lieu of apartments, for the year ending 31st March, 1918, at the rate of $5 per diem—further amount required, $600; annuity to Dr. Thomas Barnard Flint, upon his retirement from the Clerkship of the House of Commons through physical disability, $2,500—$59,900.

Mr. REID: This item of $55,000 is put in to cover the extra fifteen day's allowance to members. It also provides an amount of $2,500 to Dr. Beland and makes provision for loss on account of death. This is to take the place of the item we had in the previous estimates.

Mr. NESBITT: The other items will not be used?

Mr. REID: It will not be used. The amounts of $1,800 and $600 are necessary to cover the allowance to the Speaker and the Deputy Speaker on account of the session being so much longer than was expected. Then we have an item of $2,500 for an annuity to Dr. Flint upon his retirement from the clerkship of the House of Commons. I may say in reference to this item that we all know that Dr. Flint's health has not been very good and that he wishes to retire. I have been in the House all the time that Dr. Flint has occupied the position he now has; in fact I was here while Dr. Flint was a member of the House. We all feel sorry that his health is such that it is necessary for him to retire. He has been a splendid official, liked by every member of the House and it is a matter of regret to us that we are about to lose him. Still, these things must come and it is at his own request that he retires. The amount of $2,500 allowed as an annuity, Dr. Flint himself feels is fair and reasonable and he is quite satisfied with it. Therefore, I hope the House will allow this item to go through.

Mr. PUGSLEY: I have not been in the House nearly so long as my hon. friend the Minister of Customs (Mr. Reid) but I have been here for ten years and I have had occasion to form a critical judgment of the devotion which Dr. Flint has shown to his duties. He has given entire satisfaction, I think, to all the members of the House. One thing which I think it is proper to refer to is the fact that he has displayed very great industry in editing the work of Dr. Bourinot. He has added many most valuable notes and citations which are of very great assistance to members. His book will certainly remain as a monument to his very great industry and ability. I feel sure that my hon. friend expresses the feelings of all the members of this House when he says that it is with the deepest regret that we learn of the infirmity which makes it necessary for Dr. Flint to retire. I am also convinced that the recognition which the Government has asked the House to give him in the way of a retiring allowance will be very cheerfully approved of by the House.

Mr. KYTE: I desire to add to the observations made by my hon. friend the Minister of Customs (Mr. Reid) and my hon. friend from St. John (Mr. Pugsley) by expressing my regret that Dr Flint finds it necessary, owing to the unsatisfactory condition of his health, to retire from the very honourable and respected position of Clerk of this House. He has served many years in a public capacity and he has attained to the highest official position that could be occupied by any man in this House. It so happened when Dr Flint retired from the office of Clerk Assistant of the Legislative Assembly of Nova Scotia in 1891 I succeeded him. Since that time the relations existing between Dr Flint and myself have been of the most cordial and agreeable character. I could not say anything that would add to the esteem that Dr Flint has won for himself among the members of this House in both political parties. I speak of him both as a member of the House of Commons and an official of the House for several years. Before he assumed the position of clerk, he was representative of the county of Yarmouth in Nova Scotia for several years, and as the representative of that county he won the respect and good feeling of all his associates in the House of Commons. I can only express the wish that Dr Flint may be long spared and that the condition of his health will permit him to continue to render useful service if not to the Dominion of Canada, to the province of Nova Scotia, for many years to come.

Mr. SPEAKER: I think it would be hardly fitting that this item should go through without my saying a word along the line of the observations of those who have preceded me. It has been my privilege and pleasure to be more or less intimately associated with Dr Flint more particularly during the past two years. I can bear tribute to his unfailing courtesy and consideration to me, sometimes under somewhat trying circumstances. I know that only one desire animated Dr Flint in his public service, whether as a member or as Clerk of this House, and that was to serve to the very best of his ability. No one regrets more than the clerk himself the

infirmity which makes it absolutely necessary that this vote should appear in the estimates. I only hope that the House may be fortunate enough to have a successor in the office who will carry out the traditions as creditably as Dr Flint has.

Mr. MURPHY: In this item, No. 512, there are four amounts the first of which is $55,000. I understood the minister to say that it was in substitution for the item of $22,010 which appeared in the first supplementary estimates, page 5. If that be the case, it strikes me the phraseology of the preceding grant of $55,000 is not apt.

11 p.m.

Mr. REID: This item is changed. Item 416 reads:

To provide payment of the full sesional indemnity of members of the House of Commons —days lost through absence caused by illness, public business, being engaged in necessary farming operations, or on account of death, during the present session, including an amount of $2,500 to Hon. H. S. Béland, a prisoner of war in Germany, notwithstanding anything to the contrary in chapter 10 of the Revised Statutes, an Act respecting the Senate and House of Commons or any amendments thereto—payment to be made as the Treasury Board may direct, $22,010.

This item is changed for this reason. The session has been about twice as long as the ordinary session, and it was arranged that fifteen days over and above the fifteen days that are allowed under the statute should be allowed to the members for absence, and the item had to be remodelled to cover that arrangement. I thought the item covered the senators' absence also, but I do not know whether it can be interpreted in that way. However, as we have it now I think it is quite satisfactory to all parties.

Mr. MURPHY: Is it in substitution for the other item, or in addition?

Mr. REID: It is in substitution. The other item would not allow the extra fifteen days, so that we just substitute this item for the other.

Mr. BOIVIN: I understand that item 416, just referred to by the hon. minister and the hon. member for Russell, is not to be concurred in, or not to be used in any event.

Mr. REID: It is all in item 416. We will concur in that, but it will not be used. This item now takes the place of 416. There are a great many items in 416, and we are just putting in this item to take the place of item 416.

Mr. PUGSLEY: Should not the other be stricken out?

Mr. REID: We can strike it out, but it is not necessary. I thought it would not make much difference.

Mr. PUGSLEY: It is not good practice to vote two amounts for the one purpose. When the Speaker is in the Chair, by unanimous consent it can be stricken out.

Mr. REID: I have not gone into it, but there is nothing in that item, as far as I can see, that is different from the other, but if the House will let it go through as it is, the money will not be used.

Mr. BOIVIN: There is an additional amount provided by this item, because this amount is larger than the other item.

Mr. REID: As I understood the Finance Minister, it took the place of the other, and they have added a sufficient amount to cover the absences. Possibly there may be some difference.

Mr. PUGSLEY: If the other item is included in this, then it would be very easy, by unanimous consent of the House, to strike it out.

Mr. REID: I am going to propose concurrence after we put these items through, and if there is any objection, I will strike it out.

Mr. BOIVIN: Another point in connection with this vote is that it appears to me that the Government, by the phraseology of the vote, is placing a premium upon absence in this House, encouraging the members who stay away, and punishing those who remain. According to this vote as it stands at the present time, the member who has been away thirty days or more will receive a bonus, or a re-vote of $225.

Mr. REID: The hon. gentleman states that the Government is paying a premium on absence. This matter was arranged by the whips on both sides of the House. If there is any misunderstanding, I am not assuming any responsibility in the matter. I understand both whips agreed that, on account of the length of the session, the extra fifteen days should be allowed. If I am wrong, I should like the whips to say so.

Mr. BOIVIN: I am perfectly willing to withdraw the remark that the Government was placing a premium on absence because I do not think it was done intentionally. I do not dispute the fact that the whips may have come to such an agreement, but I think every member of this House has the right to give his own opinion concern-

ing the votes brought before the House, and I am sure the few words which I am going to utter will meet with the approval, I will not say of the majority of members but of a large number. The item, as it stands at present, amounts to this: that a member who has been absent for thirty days or more during this session is receiving $225 more than he would receive if this vote had not been put through. A member who has been absent say 18 days is receiving $45 more than he would receive if this vote were not put through, but the member who has attended to his parliamentary duties from the beginning of the session is receiving absolutely not one cent more than he would receive if the vote had not been put through. In this way those who were absent 30 days or more are receiving a reward for their absence. Those who have been absent less than 30 days, but more than 15 days, are receiving a reward, but a less reward than the man who has been away longer. Those who have remained here during the entire session, or who have lost less than 15 days, receive no reward at all. I spoke about it to the Speaker a few moments ago, and he explained to me that it would, of course, be impossible to change this vote at the present time without a new authorization from the Governor General and a new estimate, but I thought it only right to bring this point to the attention of the House. The member who has been away from this House attending to his private business, who has not been obliged to pay his living expenses in Ottawa for the time he was away, and who was undoubtedly making money in his own private affairs while absent from the House, is receiving a reward of $225. It appears to me to be illogical, and I think it would be a great deal fairer if the Government would consider the matter before the close of the session and introduce an item to add to the sessional indemnity of the other members the sum of $225, which you are giving to the members who were absent 30 days. In that way those who have been absent more than 30 days would be getting absolutely what they are getting under this vote, and the member who has been present during the entire session or absent less than 15 days, would be rewarded accordingly for his attendance here. Every one knows the session has been a lengthy one. That a large number of members have been unavoidably absent, I am willing to admit. On the other hand, there are others who certainly would have absented themselves to attend to their private business if they had known this vote was to be put through at the last moment.

I do not think that an hon. member should be punished for remaining in this House. Western members, for instance, who have been here the whole session, should not be punished for having remained in attendance. I admit that I have missed more than the fifteen days; therefore, the vote does not affect me as much as it affects members who have remained in the House. But as a matter of justice to every one, the Government should give this matter serious consideration. It should be possible tomorrow to bring in an estimate or to change the phraseology of this item with a view to providing that all members shall be treated alike. It has been pointed out that if this were done the amount of the vote would necessarily be increased. Well, there are 180 members in this House, and to give the allowance of $225 to each member would mean a vote of only $40,500. The amount of the vote as it appears in the estimates now is $55,000; moreover, those who have been absent more than 15 days would not receive as much as $225, and a certain amount would not be used. I think that that is a fair proposal, and would do justice to all members. If I used the expression that the Government was placing a premium upon absence, I did not mean to say that they were doing so intentionally. That was, perhaps, an impolite expression of what I had in my mind—that the absent member was being rewarded while the man who remained here was being punished for his attendance.

Mr. MIDDLEBRO: I hope that nobody will go away with the impression that under the proposed resolution any member of the House is going to get more than his sessional indemnity, $2,500. As this session has been practically double the length of an ordinary session, it was thought that the exemption should be for double the usual period. Under the law as it stands at present some men are absent only two days, five days, during the session, while others take their full fifteen days and get their full indemnity. In this case we have applied exactly the same principle, so far as I can see, as that which has hitherto prevailed. On the basis that there should be fifteen days' exemption for a four months' session, we are providing for an exemption of thirty days for an eight months' session. This is the only method we could adopt without passing a special

Act increasing the indemnity, and I am sure that none of the members are in favour of doing that.

Mr. PUGSLEY: Would it not be advisable to add to the end of this item the words "payment to be made as the Treasury Board may direct"? These words are usually placed at the end of such items as this.

Mr. REID: I think that that can be done. I move that after "1906" at the end of item 512 the words "payment to be made as the Treasury Board may direct" be inserted.

Amendment agreed to.

Mr. OLIVER: I wish to say a word in connection with this allowance for days of absence. I do not propose to make any motion on the subject, but it is only fair that there should be an understanding as to the different positions of members of the House coming from different sections of the country. Those of us who come from a considerable distance—from west of Lake Superior, from the Maritime Provinces, and from some constituencies in the more remote portions of Ontario and Quebec—are unable to carry on our private business while attending to the public business of the session. It appears that the members who are situated within a night's or an afternoon's railroad run of the city of Ottawa are in a position to carry on their private business while ostensibly attending to their duties in Parliament. Those of us who are not so fortunately situated have no right to find fault with those who are, provided the exercise of their liberties does not reflect upon us and do us substantial injury. As a matter of fact, the business of this House is and has been delayed session after session by the fact that such a large proportion of members live within a comparatively short distance of the capital and make it a matter of business to be absent from the House the latter end of the week and the beginning of the week thereafter. So that during the greater part of the session, instead of doing business five days in the week, we are doing business three days in the week, and sometimes hardly that. That has the effect of lengthening the session unduly; it compels the men who reside at a distance to remain here weeks and months longer than they would be required to remain if everybody stayed here and attended to business during the five or six days of the week. The penalty of a fine of $15 for each day's absence was imposed for the purpose of holding members to their work. We relieved them of that fine to the extent of fifteen days—and it is this fifteen days that has done the damage so far. Now we propose to make that fifteen days thirty days. On the one hand we declare that the interests of the country and the treasury shall be protected by a fine of $15 against each member who is absent from a day's sitting, and then we provide that the fine shall not be paid in respect of fifteen days. Now we provide that the fine shall not be paid in respect of thirty days. The position is entirely illogical. While it would, perhaps, be ineffective to make any determined opposition to this vote, I take the responsibility, following the remarks of the member for Shefford (Mr. Boivin), of placing before the House the serious disadvantage to which a large proportion of the members are subjected by reason of the undue exercise on the part of other members of the privilege and advantage of attending to their private business while the session is in progress.

Mr. VERVILLE: My hon. friend stated a moment ago that according to the law it was impossible to increase the sessional indemnity. What would prevent the Government from calling it a certain amount for expenses on account of the session being so much longer than usual? The word "expenses" is used in this item, and the same amount could be given to every hon. member to allow for expenses which have increased on account of the length of the session. It is well known that the cost of living in Canada has increased tremendously, and Ottawa is no exception. I think my suggestion would cover the objection of my hon. friend who stated a moment ago that, according to the law of the land, we could not increase the indemnity. It would not be increasing the indemnity if we called it an appropriation for extraordinary expenses on account of the length of the session. Many of us are obliged to remain here during the whole sesssion, and I do not want to be penalized —I do not use the word offensively—because we are just as much entitled to that amount of money as are others who have been away.

Mr. REID: The hon. member, from his parliamentary experience, of course, knows that it is impossible to change this item as it is now in the estimates. As this is a money Bill, the assent of His Excellency the Governor General must be obtained, and the appropriation is inserted this session in almost exactly the same way as it has been inserted in other years, with the

exception that fifteen days extra have been allowed. I understood from the Chief Whips of both sides that hon. members thought that this was a fair and reasonable thing to do. There are many members who have been here practically the whole session who have lost thirty days. I know one member in this House who, in order to attend his business, leaves on Friday afternoon for his home—and he has to go a long distance—and gets back here on Tuesday. Yet he is here Tuesday, Wednesday, Thursday and Friday until probably 4 p.m. On a session like this he would lose fifteen days, and yet he has done as much work as many others who have been here, because probably he may have taken an active part. There are, therefore, cases in which it would be hardly fair not to make a little extra allowance on account of the session lasting eight months. There is no way in which I can change this vote, and as it was understood to be agreeable to members on both sides, the Government asked His Excellency for permission to insert this item just as has been done in other years on account of days lost through absence caused by illness, public business, or on account of death, with the exception that fifteen extra days have been added.

Mr. PUGSLEY: I do not understand that the hon. gentlemen who have spoken have objected to the additional allowance of fifteen days.

Mr. REID: They wanted a change.

Mr. PUGSLEY: The suggestion is that, in order to do complete justice, some further provision should be made. There is a strange anomaly in this vote, in that it provides that a member of the House of Commons should be allowed only an extra fifteen days on account of absence through illness and so on, but in respect to our good friends in the Senate, they may be allowed a full sessional indemnity if they happen to be ill in a hospital more than ten miles from Ottawa. The result of that is that a senator who happens to be ill at his home and goes to a hospital for attendance receives his full sessional indemnity provided that his illness lasts during the whole session, while a member of the House of Commons, being equally ill and requiring medical treatment in a hospital, is allowed only an extra fifteen days' indemnity. I think the vote should be changed to make it applicable equally to members of the Senate and members of the House of Commons. It occurs to me that a fair additional vote to bring down, in order to do even a small measure of justice to members from the West who come here from a long distance, would be to make a special provision which would be particularly applicable to this session. As the minister knows, there is an allowance for expenses in coming to the opening of Parliament and in returning home after prorogation. During the present session Parliament adjourned in February and re-assembled in April, but the expenses of going home and returning, which were equally as great as those in coming to the opening of Parliament and in returning after prorogation, are not allowed for, and the members are obliged to pay their own expenses both in coming and going. It would be a small measure of justice to members who come from a long distance to give them those expenses. It would not affect me very much because my expenses in coming here are comparatively small, and I am, therefore, free to speak about the matter. I am also thankful to say that I am not affected by the fifteen days' provision, because I have not lost fifteen days during this session. While the item as to the fifteen days is right, it ought to be made uniform with regard to the Senate and the House of Commons. The minister may have put it in in this way in order to please the Senate. He is clever at framing legislation to pass both Houses.

Mr. REID: I cannot change the item as it appears in the estimates, and I think we shall have to let it go through.

Mr. PUGSLEY: There is plenty of time. Parliament does not prorogue to-night. If the minister wants to do a thing in a hurry, he can do it.

Mr. REID: There is not any opportunity for any further estimate being brought down. I would like to have these put through and concurred in. I understand the only matter that is left and that might delay prorogation is the War-time Elections Act, which has to come back from the Senate.

Mr. PUGSLEY: That cannot get through for two days yet.

Mr. REID: It has passed the Senate and will be here to-morrow.

Mr. PUGSLEY: It has to be put on the Order Paper, and it could not be taken up to-morrow.

Mr. REID: It could be taken up to-morrow with the consent of the House.

There is not anything else left, and I am sure every hon. member is anxious to get away. If we can take that Bill up to-morrow and discuss it, we shall be glad to do so.

Mr. PUGSLEY: I am sure the minister will find that there will be a desire on the part of hon. members to discuss fully any amendments that may have been made to that Bill. If, therefore, the minister approves my suggestion, there will be ample time to bring down a supplementary estimate.

Mr. REID: I am willing to bring my hon. friend's suggestion to the attention of the Government, but we would like to have that Bill proceeded with to-morrow, and then we could take the necessary time to discuss it. We do not want it to be pressed through the House faster than is necessary. I think every one of us is anxious to get away, and we should all be ready to facilitate matters as much as possible. I should like to get this item through.

Mr. PUGSLEY: This would be a very little matter to dispose of to-morrow, if the suggestion meets with my hon. friend's approval. If we are only waiting for the Franchise Bill, in the ordinary course if it does not come down until to-morrow it will not get on the Order Paper until Saturday, and we shall be kicking our heels around here all day to-morrow. Perhaps we could not be better employed than in doing justice to our western friends.

Lighthouse and coast service — Further amount required to pay pensions to retired pilots, viz.: O. Noel, F. X. Desmeules, and Adjutor Baillargeon, $800.

Mr. PUGSLEY: This relates to the lighthouse and coast service. I want to call the attention of the minister to the fact that early in the session a question was put to the Minister of Marine and Fisheries, as to whether it was proposed to give the lighthouse keepers an increase in salary. There have been a great many increases given by Parliament upon the invitation of the Government during this session, most of which were pretty strenuously opposed on this side of the House. In answer to that question, the Minister of Marine and Fisheries said that he could not hold out any hope of an increase. It is within my knowledge that there are a great many lighthouse keepers who are getting a salary, some of them, of only $300 a year. The average salary is from $300 to $400, I am informed. These men are leading a lonely life in a lighthouse upon a rock, and in the winter especially their life is surrounded with great hardships; and to expect men to continue to perform those arduous duties and undergo the hardships they are compelled to undergo for the small salary of $300 is to my mind not at all creditable to a country like Canada. I regret very much that the minister was not able to give some assurance that the representations which have been made to him would be favourably entertained, and I would ask the minister now whether he could see his way clear to bringing down before the close of this session an item providing for an increase of even $100 a year for these men. They are affected by the high cost of living just as other people are, and the salaries which they receive may truly be called starvation salaries. They cannot live upon them. In some cases lighthouse keepers can make some money out of fishing, but those cases are the exceptions. The great majority have nothing but their salaries, which are entirely inadequate for them to live upon and to bring up their families.

Mr. REID: I will bring the matter before the members of Council to-morrow and see whether anything can be done.

To complete special allowance to the Chief Justice of the Supreme Court of Canada to cover travelling and other expenses in connection with his services while acting as Deputy to His Excellency the Governor General, $2,500.

Mr. EDWARDS: I should like a little explanation of this item. I am informed that the salary of the Chief Justice of Canada is $10,000 a year. Is that correct?

Mr. REID: Yes.

Mr. EDWARDS: I am also informed that he receives an allowance of $2,500 for travelling expenses when he goes overseas to attend the meetings of the Privy Council. Is that right?

Mr. REID: Yes, he is a member of the Privy Council.

Mr. EDWARDS: I presume he has not attended many sittings during the last three years. As I understand it, he now receives $2,500 for signing his name for the Governor-General. We propose here to add another $2,500, making $5,000 which the Chief Justice will receive to cover travelling and other expenses in connection with his services while acting as deputy to His Excellency the Governor-General. I am informed that the Chief Justice lives in Ottawa. Is that right?

Mr. REID: Yes.

Mr. EDWARDS: If he is within the city limits, his travelling expenses ought not to be very heavy. I do not believe this increase of $2,500 is warranted. I do not believe there is a man in this House who believes it is warranted, and I am going to test the feeling of the committee by moving that the item be struck out.

Mr. REID: The hon. member is correct in stating that the salary of the Chief Justice is $10,000. The Chief Justice has also been receiving $5,000 per annum to cover travelling and other expenses in connection with his services while acting as Deputy to His Excellency the Governor General. It is true the Chief Justice lives in Ottawa, but there are times when he may be a considerable distance away and has to return to the city. We had $5,000 in the estimates last year for this purpose, but through some error, the amount was put in at $2,500 this year, and we are simply asking that the item be restored to the usual amount. It is not an increase at all. The other item of $2,500 in the main estimates is to cover the expenses of the Chief Justice when attending the sittings of the Judicial Committee of the Privy Council. I hardly think it would be fair to reduce the item by $2,500. I am sorry this mistake was made in preparing the estimates, and I would ask the House to agree to the $2,500 being restored.

Mr. EDWARDS: I do not want to be unreasonable, but $5,000 for signing one's name a few times does seem to me to be piling it on pretty thick. Ten thousand dollars as Chief Justice, and five thousand dollars as Deputy to the Governor General makes fifteen thousand a year. I do not think the time and work of the Chief Justice can begin to be compared with the time and work of the Prime Minister and the leader of the Opposition.

It seems to me to be entirely unreasonable that a gentleman living right here in Ottawa should receive $5,000 for occasionally signing his name. If we want to increase the salary of the Chief Justice of Canada, let us put it in as increase in salary. Personally, I think this item might very well be cut out altogether. I think the Chief Justice of Canada or some other justice living here in Ottawa could, without receiving any pay for it, sign his name a few times, if the Governor General happens to be away on his holidays. In regard to those trips overseas, I do not know whether I am right or not, but I have heard it stated that the Chief Justice has drawn the $2,500 for travelling and other expenses in connection with attending the Privy Council in England, when, as a matter of fact, he never left Canada, but still drew the amount, taking it as part of his salary. Hon. gentlemen spoke here a while ago to the effect that the minister might bring in a little item which would hand a couple of hundred dollars to various members of this House who had been regular in their attendance, in order to even things up, that is, that a small amount might be granted the western members and those from the extreme East, in consideration of the extra expense they were put to on account of the break in the session. This is something which would have to receive very earnest, and careful, and prayerful consideration, before it could be put through, but a matter of $5,000 to the Chief Justice of Canada for simply scribbling his name a few times is dead easy.

Mr. REID: The salary of the Chief Justice is $10,000. Merely expressing my own personal opinion, and not referring to the present Chief Justice or any one else in particular, I would say the man who is fit to occupy the position of Chief Justice of Canada is a man who could earn perhaps twice as much as $10,000. So far as the salary of the Prime Minister is concerned, there is no doubt in my mind that the Prime Minister could earn three times as much as he does were he to relinquish the position he occupies, and go back to the practice of his profession. I say the same of the leader of the Opposition were he a young man. I do not think the Prime Minister or the leader of the Opposition is paid the amount to which they are severally entitled.

Mr. GRAHAM: Are you too modest to discuss the question as to whether the members of the Government get enough?

Mr. REID: I will not discuss that. It has always been the custom to pay this amount to the Chief Justice of the Supreme Court, and the Government feel that as he has been receiving $5,000 for the position, it is hardly fair to reduce it. While I have no objection to the hon. member from Frontenac (Mr. Edwards) expressing his opinion, I would like the House to concur in this item.

Mr. PUGSLEY: The item is put in to cover "travelling and other expenses." I quite agree with my hon. friend from Frontenac (Mr. Edwards) that $5,000 seems a large item for "travelling and other ex-

penses." I think it would be better to make an allowance to the Chief Justice as deputy Governor General, by reason of the very high and honourable position he holds and by reason of the fact that he does discharge the duties of deputy Governor General. I think it would be better to put it on that distinct ground. To my mind it would not be proper to strike out the item, because the Chief Justice of the Supreme Court of Canada has always acted as deputy Governor General, and has always received an allowance. I do not know whether it was $5,000 per year. It certainly would seem rather ungracious to discriminate against the present occupant of that high position and refuse to treat him in the same way as his predecessors have been treated. I agree with the minister, that the salary of the Chief Justice of Canada is not by any means a large one. I think we pay the Chairman of the Board of Railway Commissioners $15,000 a year, $5,000 a year more than the salary of the Chief Justice of Canada. The other day a vote was passed to pay the Chairman of the Bureau of Research $10,000 per annum. As has been stated, a lawyer in good practice in Canada can earn twice or three times as much as the salary of the Chief Justice, and a gentleman of the eminence of the Chief Justice could easily earn at the Bar from $25,000 to $50,000 per annum in the larger cities. I do not object to voting the amount. What I object to is the language of the vote and the way it is put, as "travelling and other expenses."

Post Office—Outside Service.

To increase the minimum salary of railway mail clerks from $500 to $600, and to raise the annual statutory increases of railway mail clerks from $50 to $100 in cases where the salary is over $800, notwithstanding anything in the Civil Service Act or the Post Office Act; also to provide for the payment of provisional allowance of $100 each to Civil Service employees of the Outside Service of the Post Office Department whose salaries are $1,600 and under, and also to provide for the establishment of inspectorate at North Battleford, Sask., $608,000.

Mr. PARDEE: I would like to direct the attention of the Government to the question of staff and non-staff post offices. For some reason best known to the Post Office Department, the man who is in a staff post office is a member of the Civil Service, is entitled to a pension, and his salary is increased from year to year under the Civil Service Act, whereas a man in another place, which may be just as large as some of the staff post offices but which is a non-staff post office, is not entitled to be a member of the Civil Service, is not entitled to any pension, and his salary is not automatically increased under the Civil Service Act. Formerly, in those non-staff post offices, the postmaster got a percentage of the revenue, and he paid the clerks out of that percentage.

Later, that percentage was taken away from the postmaster, he was put on a fixed salary, and the clerks were also put upon fixed salaries. If the Acting Postmaster General will look into the matter he will find that clerks have been sixteen or eighteen years in the service and that they have never had one dollar of an increase during that period whilst the revenue of these offices has gone up tremendously. That is simply unjust. Why the hard and fast rule should be made by the department that one should be a staff office and that the other should not be a staff office, and that because there is this difference the employees in one office should have the right to belong to the Civil Service, to be entitled to pensions and to increases of salary, whereas the others are deprived of every one of these benefits, is something that I cannot understand. This is the most unjustifiable treatment that could be accorded to any class of men who are working for the State. In my own town there is a man who has been in the post office for eleven years. He has not received a dollar of increase in that time, and his hours are from seven in the morning until half-past eight at night. Other clerks are in the same position. There are men who have been employed for varying terms, some for as long as twenty years, and not a dollar of increase has been given. While I absolutely approve of the increase in the salaries of mail clerks, a recognition which they are very much entitled to, I do not see why the Government cannot take into consideration those men who belong to those non-staff post offices and who are receiving the same salaries as they have received for years while it costs fifty per cent more to live. Taking into consideration their terms of service, an increase in their salaries would be a simple act of justice on the part of the department, and that increase ought to be proportionately the same increase as is granted to the mail clerks by this vote.

Mr. DOHERTY: I have a very considerable sympathy with what the hon. member has just said. I am transiently and quite newly in charge of this department. I had my attention called to the system of semi-staff post offices, and I have been somewhat puzzled as to what was the advantage

in maintaining that separate and distinct system. I understand the distinction is that in the first place you have a post office where the postmaster has a percentage of the revenue and he provides his own help. These offices are in certain cases converted into what are called semi staff offices, the Government taking the entire revenue and paying the salaries of the postmaster and clerks out of the revenue. I have had it in my mind to look into the whole reason for the existence of the system. But apart from that, this class of clerks is not dealt with in the present vote, because, if an addition were to be paid to them it would be paid out of the revenue of the post office. I cannot say more than that I purpose to look into it to ascertain the reason for the differentiation, and if there be an apparent injustice I will endeavour to remedy it.

12 m.

Mr. MURPHY: The provision of the item is to raise the annual statutory increase from $50 to $100 in cases where the salary is over $800. It would seem to me that the increase is more needed where the salary is below $800. There may be a reason for this, and if so, I would like my hon. friend to inform the committee regarding it.

Mr. DOHERTY: Under the item the minimum salary is being raised from $500 to $600. In the past the lower salaries have been increased at the rate of $50 per annum and not at the rate of $100. A line was drawn between those who increased by $50 and those who increased by $100, and that, I understand, has been at $1,000. It is proposed to extend the increase of $100 to those having a salary of $800. There is a very limited class below that which is not dealt with.

Mr. MURPHY: Why not give it to the lower class?

Mr. DOHERTY: The prayer of the petition that was put before me was to extend it so that clerks receiving salaries of over $800 should get the benefit. I am not clear why there should be a distinction between those above and those below, but the grievance that was complained of was that while those getting over $1,000 got this annual increase of $100 those below $1,000 did not. Therefore, those below $1,000 and above $800 had a grievance. That is why the distinction was made. Frankly, I am not in a position to state why it was not extended to those receiving less than $800.

[Mr. Doherty.]

Mr. MURPHY: I see, also, that the vote is:

To provide for the payment of provisional allowance of $100 each to Civil Service employees of the Outside Service of the Post Office Department, whose salaries are $1,600 and under.

What is the effect of the words "provisional allowance?" Does that differentiate it from an annual increase? Is that a flat amount, given generally?

Mr. DOHERTY: It is a flat amount of $100. In the supplementary estimates there was an item to provide an allowance of $100 to employees of the Civil Service receiving under $1,000. That increase has been given, I think, in practically all the departments this year, to put the lower salaried men in a better position to meet the increased demands upon them by reason of the high cost of living. It has been done by way of an allowance without an increase of salary. This also is an allowance, but the difference here is that in regard to post office clerks and certain classes of railway mail clerks it has been extended to those getting up to $1,600. While we are doing this under the guise of a temporary allowance the classes of clerks that are covered have in reality a very substantial ground of complaint of inequality between their position, from the point of view of salary, and that of Civil Service employees of a similar grade generally. I will give one instance. In 1914 legislation was passed by this House providing that the increase to the railway mail clerks should be at the rate of $100 per annum instead of $50 per annum, as it previously had been.

Both this House and the Senate concurred in the view that that was a proper provision, but, unfortunately for the railway mail clerks, they were not dealt with by the Bill applicable to the employees of the post offices generally, which was enacted at the same time, or shortly before. A provision for making their increase $100 a year, instead of $50, was contained in the Bill, which also contained certain provisions with regard to the charges made to the newspapers for carrying the mail. The Senate, while it approved of what was done for the class of mail clerks, refused to assent to the provision with regard to the carriage of the newspapers. The Bill came back to this House, and the Postmaster General at the time refused to accept the amendment of the Senate in regard to the newspapers, and it was not found possible to bring the two Houses to an agreement upon that subject, and by reason of that disagreement,

for the last three years this class of clerks have been getting an increase of $50 a year, whereas the other employees drawing similar salaries were receiving an increase of $100 a year. These clerks pressed —unfortunately at a late period of the session—for a re-enactment of the legislation of 1914, and further pressed that it should be made, as seems to me only fair, to count from the time it was originally passed, so that they might be on a footing of equality with their fellow employees. When this matter was brought to my attention, and the attention of the Government generally, it was too late to deal with it by legislation during the present session, and after an interview with the gentlemen, in which they put their case strongly, they acquiesced in the view that it was too late to do anything, and expressed their readiness to accept, as compensation, at all events for the past, this allowance of $100 for this year. We look forward in the future to rectify the injustice done to them. For the time being we are giving something less than they would have received if that legislation had been passed at the time, by way of compensation, for what I really think they have been unfairly deprived of by the accident which happened in regard to the Bill.

Mr. MURPHY: This refers to Civil Service employees of the Outside Service. What does that mean?

Mr. DOHERTY: I understand it would cover every class of employee in the Post Office Department of the Outside Service. We are not making a distinction between the different classes. We have letter carriers and clerks and they are subdivided into different classes. There are railway mail clerks, clerks in the Service, in the post office, letter carriers, and a large number of different denominations of employees, and we use the word "employees" to make it cover everybody.

Mr. McKENZIE: I desire to bring to the notice of the House a question which I think deserves consideration. We have a certain body of officials around this building called messengers. I do not know that their employment comes under any department. Perhaps the Speaker's jurisdiction covers this class more than any other jurisdiction. I was asked by some of those very useful gentlemen who are employed around the building to bring their case to the notice of the Government, and I would just as soon bring it to the notice of the Minister of Justice as of any other person. They say their pay is very small. I understand they are getting $3.25 a day and the minister will readily understand that is very small remuneration under present conditions. They have to live in the city of Ottawa. They come from distances. They must live in respectable places and $3.25 a day has not much purchasing power at the present time. No doubt these messengers have people dependent upon them, families to support. They have been coming here for years, and they have been invited to come. I think the country should provide decently for their services, and see that they are not losing their time, and that they have something to the good when they go home for the support of those dependent upon them. I, therefore, appeal to all the ministers here that they take the messengers' case into consideration, and out of some vote give them such an increase in their pay as may be considered proper. Perhaps the Speaker has more to do with this class of employees than the head of any other department. The Speaker might look over the list, see what they have been receiving, and make a fair allowance to them. I happened to be addressed by some of those men, and I shall be very proud if I can be of any service to them in bringing this matter to the notice of the House.

Mr. PARDEE: I desire to draw the attention of the acting Postmaster General and the Minister of Customs to an article which appeared in to-day's papers regarding the appointment of the postmaster at New Hamburg.

Mr. GRAHAM: What riding is that in?

Mr. PARDEE: Waterloo, I think. We have heard a great deal from the opposite side of the House regarding the treatment of returned soldiers, and I well recollect, as do other members of this committee, the vehement declaration of the Minister of Customs that returned soldiers should always be taken care of, and that they should have the first call on positions which they could fill. This appears to me to be a very striking case. A young man named Laschinger, who lived in New Hamburg, is about to return from the front wounded. One of his legs had to be amputated, and the index finger of his right hand is gone. His father, the postmaster at New Hamburg, died very recently and the young man, through his friends, applied for the position. It is said that 90 per cent of the inhabitants of New Hamburg signed a petition asking that this young chap be ap-

pointed. I believe he has a mother and some other members of the family who will be practically dependent upon him. The position has not been given back to him. Instead a young man named Rau has been appointed.

An hon. MEMBER: A raw deal.

Mr. PARDEE: A raw deal and a raw man, a wealthy man living in New Hamburg. He is very well off, and runs a local brewery, a very prosperous citizen who does not need the appointment for the purpose of a livelihood one bit. We on this side of the House have heard, without end, and without any possible end until after this election, declarations of what the Conservative party would do for the soldiers—protestations of their loyalty and so on. It has been stated that these men would be taken care of, and that the Government party was the only people who could take care of them. Almost the first instance that happens is the case of a boy whose father had the office before him, whose family were dependent upon the revenue of that office for a livelihood, and where 90 per cent of the people of the town, including Liberals and Conservatives, signed a petition in order to have him appointed in his father's place, and we find the Government, instead of appointing that soldier boy, took the recommendation of the Conservative committee in New Hamburg and appointed a man who has always been a stalwart Conservative, who does not need the office for a livelihood and who was given that office purely on account of his party allegiance.

It would be well, therefore, if we should hear fewer protestations of loyalty to our soldiers on the part of hon. gentlemen opposite, who seem to think that they are the only persons justified in uttering them. "By their fruits ye shall know them,"—The instance that I have quoted is a very striking one.

Mr. REID: The hon. member has insinuated that that is the policy which is being carried out in my department.

Mr. PARDEE: I did not say anything of the kind.

Mr. REID: That is the inference that I draw from his remarks. I defy the hon. gentleman to name one instance in which I have filled a position in the Customs Department by the appointment of a person other than a returned soldier.

Mr. GRAHAM: My hon. friend admits that the policy adopted by the Post Office Department is wrong.

Mr. REID: The hon. member should not put words in my mouth. I am stating the policy that I have followed in the Customs Department. So far as I know, that policy has been followed in other departments in all cases where returned soldiers have been available. The member for West Lambton has referred to the case at New Hamburg. I know nothing about it; I do not know whether or not the acting Postmaster General (Mr. Doherty) knows anything about it. My only reason for rising is to take issue with any hon. gentleman in this House who says that in the Department of Customs returned soldiers have not been appointed to fill vacancies. I have tried to follow out the principle of giving these positions to returned soldiers, wherever that was possible.

Mr. PARDEE: Then when my hon. friend made the declaration that returned soldiers would be appointed, he was making it not for the Government, but simply for himself.

Mr. REID: I stated to the hon. member that the Order in Council had been passed and that we were acting upon it.

Mr. MACDONALD: You never observed it.

Mr. REID: I have observed it all along; that policy has been followed out in almost every case, in accordance with the Order in Council.

Mr. MACDONALD: When it came to the appointment of a postmaster in the town of Stellarton, the man who held the patronage was consulted, returned soldier or no returned soldier. The postmaster was dismissed, and, far from taking a returned soldier, they appointed to the position the president of the Conservative Association of that town. Further than that, they rented his store at $600 a year—a store for which no one else would pay more than $200 a year—and all this while a dozen returned soldiers were walking around the streets. The Minister of Customs is a good bluffer; he gets up and tells us what he does, and defies hon. gentlemen on the other side to do this or to do that. He is a very good fellow, but he cannot get away with that kind of thing. As to the Post Office Department, they do not pretend to observe the principle of appointing returned soldiers.

Mr. GRAHAM: The trouble is that the hon. gentleman who is at the head of the Post Office Department is not in the House —he may be busy; I am not saying anything about that. Every week the Post Office Department violates the policy of appointing returned soldiers. The member for West Lambton mentioned a case that occurred in New Hamburg; I have in mind another case in an adjoining county. I brought it to the attention of the House some weeks ago, and a discussion thereupon arose in reference to positions in Montreal, in the course of which the Minister of Customs made certain statements. In the case to which I refer the same thing happened; the people of both political parties asked for the appointment of a returned soldier who was fit for the position, but the recommendation of the member for the district was acted upon and the position was given to a politician, just as if no policy had been adopted of appointing returned soldiers. Moreover, that action was contrary to the wishes of the people.

Mr. DOHERTY: When and where did that happen?

Mr. GRAHAM: I will look it up in Hansard. It was in a western Ontario constituency; the member for the district was in the House when I made the statement, and he offered no contradiction.

Mr. DOHERTY: When was it?

Mr. GRAHAM: About two weeks ago; I cannot tell the exact date. We had a general discussion then about the appointment of returned soldiers, which, I think, led up to the announcement that was made by the Minister of Customs.

Mr. DOHERTY: My hon. friend will admit that that information is somewhat vague. If positive statements are made and I am held responsible, I should be informed when and where the instances have occurred.

Mr. GRAHAM: I will look up the details and let my hon. friend know. It is in Hansard; I thought that after the discussion that took place every one would be familiar with the circumstances of the case. If the hon. gentleman was not in the House, I should have thought that he would be informed by other ministers.

Mr. DOHERTY: Unfortunately, things go on Hansard that are the result of misinformation on the part of gentlemen who may make statements in good faith. As a matter of fairness, when we are told that these things are being done every week, we should be informed also when and where they have occurred.

Mr. MACDONALD: What about the Stellarton case?

Mr. DOHERTY: When did the Stellarton case occur?

Mr. MACDONALD: About four months ago. I brought the matter up twice; my hon. friend ought to have looked into it before now.

Mr. GRAHAM: Pleading ignorance is a poor excuse.

Mr. DOHERTY: A question was put about a building that had been rented for the Stellarton post office. I certainly have no recollection of the hon. gentleman's making any statement, when I was present, concerning the matter to which he refers.

Mr. MACDONALD: I put another question on the Order Paper in regard to the dismissal of the postmaster and the appointment of another person to the position. Possibly my hon. friend (Mr. Doherty) was not acting minister at that time. Anyway, the answer was put on Hansard. I can cite another instance, the case of the vacancy in the postmastership at Charlottetown. The people in the city were pressing for the appointment of a very prominent returned soldier, but their representations were disregarded; the recommendation of the members for the county was accepted and another man appointed.

Mr. KYTE: Another case came to my attention some time ago. A young man who had been employed as a messenger in this House returned from the front with one of his arms disabled as a result of injuries received in the firing line. He told me that he had been recommended for a position in the Department of Naval Affairs at a salary of $90 a month. After working there for some two weeks, he was dismissed and a young lady was given his position. He was then given employment as a messenger in this building—he is not here at present, so anything that I may say will not prejudice him in any employment that he would receive from a department of the Government. I think it is well that we should do what we can to remove the masks which hon. gentlemen sitting on the treasury benches are wearing so smugly in this matter. Only a few months ago it was stated in the Toronto papers that a returned soldier who applied for a position was told to go to the chairman of the Conservative Patronage Committee. There

has been no denial of that. Hon. gentlemen who are interested may profess great indignation, but everybody knows throughout the country that the only use the Government has for returned soldiers is the use that they make of them at election time. In my constituency there are a number of returned soldiers. Two positions have been vacant during the last four years—preventive officer of Customs and collector of Customs. These vacancies are not filled because the dispenser of political patronage in my constituency has promised the position to so many that he dare not fill it until the election is over—and then it will be too late. Why are returned soldiers in my constituency not appointed to those positions? Because, as I say, the political patronage managers insist that these appointments shall go not to men who have won glory and performed service on the battlefield, but to men who are performing service for the Conservative party in the constituency in which they reside.

Mr. ROBB: I understood the Minister of Customs to say that by Order in Council the Government had determined upon a policy of giving preference to returned soldiers. As forewarned is forearmed, I want to draw the attention of the acting Postmaster General to the fact that tenders are being asked for a mail route running out of Hemmingford. One of the tenderers is a returned soldier who was wounded. I met him yesterday at a local fair. He told me he had put in his tender, and had attached to his tender the certificate from the doctor certifying to his injury. Will the minister now say, that, all conditions being equal, he will give the preference to this returned soldier?

Mr. DOHERTY: If all conditions are equal I certainly would carry out the provision of the Order in Council. Hon. gentlemen have spoken very loudly and violently and have told us about what "everybody" knew. They have been very vague—in particular the hon. member for Richmond (Mr. Kyte). They have covered a very wide field. I do not quite see that that is a fair method to prove a charge. If the policy has been departed from in the Post Office Department it is most assuredly not within my knowledge. It is not quite conclusive to say: There is a position; there is a returned soldier; the returned soldier, and the position do not come in contact; therefore, you are departing from your system. Hon. gentlemen, I suppose, will admit there are certain classes of men with certain qualifications suited to fill certain positions, and I do not suppose that the suggestion is that the mere fact of a man being a returned soldier, and the mere fact of there existing a vacant position without regard to the qualifications of the returned soldier on the one side and the requirements of the position on the other, should cause the position at once to be filled by the returned soldier. The hon. gentleman puts to me the question in a perfectly fair way. Other things being equal, the provision of the Order in Council would call for preference being given to the returned soldier. I do not think hon. gentlemen will show that, in my personal action, that being the condition, the Order in Council has not been acted upon.

Mr. KYTE: I will recall to the Acting Postmaster General a case in which, perhaps, he will admit that the returned soldier was qualified. Take the case of the post office in the city of Charlottetown, P.E.I. A vacancy occurred there some time ago. A returned soldier, who was a university graduate, was an applicant for the position. He was recommended by most of the responsible people in the city of Charlottetown, but he did not receive the appointment. Political considerations again intervened, and the position went to the man who had the recommendation of the patronage committee. There is clearly a case in which the applicant, a returned soldier, came in contact with the position, and had all the qualifications necessary, but he did not receive the appointment.

Mr. DOHERTY: Is the hon. gentleman's position that every university graduate is the best man to be appointed to fill a position in a post office in any particular place?

Mr. KYTE: I should think, if a university graduate is available for the position of postmaster in Charlottetown, the acting Postmaster General would have to furnish pretty good evidence to the contrary before he could convince anybody that that man was not competent to take charge of it. I do not wish to hold the acting Postmaster General responsible for this. I am speaking generally in regard to the Government. The policy the Government has laid down in Orders in Council, which have been flaunted frequently before the faces of hon. members on this side of the House, is being violated every day, and the acting Postmaster General, as a member of the Government, must take his full share of responsibility in the matter.

Mr. SINCLAIR: If the statements made by the hon. member for Richmond (Mr. Kyte) are true, what does the minister purpose doing about the Charlottetown case? Will he give the position to the university graduate who is a wounded soldier and who has returned?

Mr. DOHERTY: I will make inquiry as to the qualifications of the respective candidates. I have the honour to be a university graduate myself, and I am prepared to concede that there are hundreds of men who are not university graduates who are more competent to fill the position of postmaster almost anywhere than I should be. I cannot accept the test of being a university graduate as a proof of competence to fill the position.

Mr. KYTE: There is only one test—the political test.

Mr. GRAHAM: You ought to call in the Civil Service Act.

Mr. PUGSLEY: The Government ought to admit that all these appointments are made on the recommendation of the patronage committee. Those patronage committees are just as active in all the constituencies throughout the country as they were before the war broke out. Patronage is everywhere. The other day a gentleman in Montreal to whom a young lady, a nurse, applied for a recommendation, saying she wanted to serve her country, said to her: "I shall be very glad to come to Ottawa and see what I can do for you." This is the statement of a man of the very highest character. When he came to Ottawa he was asked what this young lady's father was in politics.

Mr. MEIGHEN: By whom?

Mr. PUGSLEY: By somebody in Ottawa to whom he went.

Mr. MEIGHEN: Somebody!

Some hon. MEMBERS: Oh, oh.

Mr. PUGSLEY: A gentleman to whom he thought he ought to go in order to get the position for this lady. I know of another case in which a medical man in charge of an ambulance corps was urged by a prominent member of the patronage committee to take on some nurses. He declined because he did not want them. He was called up again and asked if he was not going to play the game fairly. He declined again. It was not long before, I am told, a peremptory order came from Ottawa to take on one of those nurses at once, although there was absolutely no reason in the world why she should be taken on, because her services were not required. In the city of St. John, from which I come, it is known by everybody that since the war began the patronage committee is the Government so far as that constituency is concerned. I believe that is the case also throughout the country. You may speak about the affairs of Canada being administered from Ottawa, they are not; they are administered by the patronage committees in the different constituencies. The patronage committees form a part of the machinery of this Government. Not long ago, there was a proposition to form a Union Government, and it was suggested that the Minister of Trade and Commerce (Sir George Foster) should be the Prime Minister of this country. At a caucus of my hon. friends opposite, they stated they would not have the Minister of Trade and Commerce as Prime Minister. They knew that he had declared in this House that he was opposed to patronage, and they considered that if he became Prime Minister patronage would be done away with. Tnerefore they refused to entertain the suggestion that he should become Prime Minister. The party machine must still continue, as under Union Government the Conservative party machine would continue to administer the affairs of this Dominion from coast to coast.

With regard to my hon. friend from West Lambton (Mr. Pardee), who spoke of the very great hardship to this boy and his family by reason of his not being allowed to have the position for which he was recommended and which his father had previously filled, I suppose he has been informed that his female relatives are to be allowed to vote in the next election. Why, then, should they complain? Surely that ought to be a compensation for any financial distress which they may suffer. Has my hon. friend from North Waterloo (Mr. Weichel) written to them that they are to be allowed to vote in the coming election, and therefore they must not complain that their brother is ill-treated in respect to the position?

In Military District No. 6, in the Maritime Provinces, to-day there are 257 gentlemen holding positions in the Militia Department, only ten of whom have been overseas, while there are in the Great War Veterans' Association of St. John, I think about 350 members, who could easily be placed in those positions, running from small salaries up to the enormous sum of

$6,200 per year. Let me read the resolution which the Great War Veterans' Association have sent me, and I do it because it shows that it is all a hollow pretense to say that this Government is prepared to do everything it can for the returned soldier. The resolution, which was passed at a general meeting at St. John on September 12, 1917, is as follows:

Resolved, that the attention of the Premier and Minister of Militia and Defence be drawn to the state of affairs existing in the Militia Department, District No. 6. In a recent list of officers employed in Military District No. 6, there was shown to be 257 holding positions, of whom only 10 had seen service at the front, and these were all holding minor positions, while the better positions were held by officers who had never seen service overseas or had made no attempt to do so.

Therefore, resolved that these officers should be made to go overseas or revert to civil life and take their chance with conscripts when called, and their places taken by returned officers who have done their duty for the Empire.

Also that all men employed in safety-first jobs who have not been overseas be sent immediately to the front and their places taken with returned men wounded for their country.

Further resolved that a copy of this resolution be sent to Hon. J. D. Hazen and Hon. Dr. Pugsley as minister and members of St. John, and they be asked to take a definite stand in this matter and report same and advise the intention of the Government in this matter.

Yours respectfully,

(Sgd.) E. J. Puddy, Secretary,

The Great War Veterans' Association, St. John.

I bring this before the House and, through Hansard, before the people of this country. I say that these returned soldiers are realizing to-day that they are not receiving fair treatment at the hands of this Government, and it is necessary the Government should be aroused to a sense of its duty in respect of positions which returned soldiers could fill. They are now walking the streets, waiting for recognition, feeling that their services demand recognition, but as I have said, all the recognition which they are to get from this Government practically is that their female relatives are to be allowed to vote. Why should they not complain at this treatment? Is the mere privilege of voting to be regarded by this Government as being a fair and reasonable recognition of the services which these men have performed for their country?

Mr. MEIGHEN: I suppose hon. gentlemen opposite consider it a fitting opportunity to make vague charges of insincerity against the Government with respect to returned soldiers now, just as the session is to close, and when in all probability no individual case, if the hon. member has courage enough to mention any case, can be investigated closely and replied to fully. We are charged with extreme partisanship, running the country by patronage committees—charged by hon. gentlemen opposite who, throughout this session, have displayed a partisanship that should make them historic and immortal. This session has witnessed an effort on the part of hon. gentlemen on this side of the House, concurred in by the whole party, to bury partisanship so far as the war is concerned, and to share the Government of Canada with all who are in favour of this war—an offer declined by hon. gentlemen opposite who raised the flag of party, fought under the flag of party, and persisted in fighting under the flag of party to the end.

A case was mentioned by the hon. member for West Lambton (Mr. Pardee) as taking place in the town of New Hamburg, I know the town of New Hamburg, but I never heard of this case. The member for the county is absent to-day, but I know that he intends to contest that constituency at the next election, and I know he would not make any mistake in the town of New Hamburg in regard to returned soldiers. I think he may be able to speak to the case to-morrow, and I hope he will be able to do so. The facts are not all brought out with regard to that case yet. To say that 90 per cent of the town of New Hamburg supported this returned soldier for postmaster and that he was refused the appointment is not a full statement of the case, even if it is correct so far as it goes, and I question very much if the information of the hon. member for West Lambton is correct. To lay down the proposition that because a man is a university graduate, all other considerations as to qualifications must be laid aside, and that that fact alone establishes that he should have the appointment, is a very strange proposition for a member of this Parliament to lay down. Do hon. gentlemen not know university graduates who are about the least well qualified people they could think of for the position of postmaster? I know nothing of the case in the city of Charlottetown, but the city of Charlottetown will pass on that case when it comes to the contest at the polls. I venture to say that when charges are made in the city of Charlottetown about returned soldiers being treated unjustly the charges will have reference to the western coast. It will be a case of the hon. member for St. John over again: somebody told somebody else in some far-off city that somebody could not get a position unless her father

voted so and so, or some one told some one else in the city of Toronto that he had to go to the Patronage Committee to get the position. These will be the charges levelled in Charlottetown, instead of bringing up an individual case in that city where the facts would be well known. I think it is altogether unlikely that an injustice would be done in that city any more than anywhere else.

I am engaged at the present time in correspondence with a returned soldier from the western provinces. He is a man with a family, but he left his family and went overseas. He left a Government job, not under a Conservative Government, but under a Liberal Government, and he is still pleading to get the job back which he left.

Mr. MACDONALD: Under what Government?

Mr. MEIGHEN: The Government of Manitoba.

Mr. McKENZIE: They are for union Government.

Mr. MEIGHEN: Not being able to get his job back, he appeals to the Government of Canada to provide something for him.

Mr. MACDONALD: What was his name and position?

Mr. MEIGHEN: I will not give his name.

Mr. PUGSLEY: It is you who are now making vague charges.

Mr. McKENZIE: Is it Doctor Simpson?

Mr. MEIGHEN: When I have a charge to make against hon. gentlemen opposite, I will name the man. I do not want to do an injustice to him, or to prejudice his chances of getting that position. It would be unjust to him to mention his name; the hon. gentleman knows that. But those are the facts just the same. I do not say that there is no reason why he should not get his position back. There may be a reason I know nothing of, but if there is such, I know not what it is. It just shows that one needs to know all the facts of a case before making charges against any one. There are returned soldiers in every province. There are perhaps returned soldiers who have not Government positions, but for the most part, they have all some sort of position out in the province from which I come. Not only in cases where the merits are about even, but where they are anything like even, the position in all cases I ever heard of, goes to the returned soldier. Many and many a position in the province of Manitoba has gone to a returned soldier, and nobody has ever complained about a Patronage Committee that I ever heard of. For that matter, I have no Patronage Committee.

I know not in the province of Manitoba of a single complaint that any returned soldier has been done an injustice. There are positions that all returned soldiers cannot fill. There are very few positions that all returned soliders can fill. And it does not do a returned soldier any good to put him in a position he is not qualified to fill. A returned soldier cannot fill many a staff position and you give him no advantage by placing him in a position he is unfitted for. Instead of doing him a benefit, you do him an injury. I would ask hon. gentlemen opposite to point to an individual case, and if they can establish it against us then they have gone a lot further than they have gone to-night. Wherever that case is it will be under review in the constituency when we come to the polls, and I have no doubt whatever how the returned soldiers of this country are going to vote, and the result.

Mr. PUGSLEY: Would you like to bet on it?

Mr. MEIGHEN: That is always the answer of the man who has no other answer "would you like to bet?"

Mr. PUGSLEY: Don't be too confident.

Mr. MEIGHEN: Let hon. gentlemen bring up the treatment of returned soldiers, not in constituencies a thousand miles away on the word of somebody, or nobody, or everybody, but let them bring it up in the very constituency itself, and thresh it out on its merits, and the people will give their verdict, and we have no fear of it.

Mr. SINCLAIR: It is not altogether fair for the Secretary of State to charge hon. members on this side of the House with being indefinite in their criticism. I think they have been very definite. My hon. friend from West Lambton (Mr. Pardee) has given him a specific case, which he has not been able to answer. My hon. friend from Richmond (Mr. Kyte) has given him another specific case, well known in eastern Nova Scotia and Prince Edward Island. He has made no reply. My hon. friend from Pictou (Mr. Macdonald) has mentioned another case in the town of Stellarton. The Secretary of State has not been able to answer any of these. If he wants another case, I will give him a fourth.

Mr. MEIGHEN: The case in Stellarton was four months ago, when the acting minister was not in charge of the office. Why did not the hon. member put a question on the Order Paper and bring the matter up then?

Mr. GRAHAM: The question was on the Order Paper long ago.

Mr. SINCLAIR: The case I have in mind is that of a returned nurse. Recently the Government established a hospital in the city of Sydney, called the Moxham Hospital for convalescent soldiers. It was necessary to engage a matron to take charge of the hospital. A very competent young lady, who had seen service at the front, made application for the position. Every one said she was well qualified and should have been appointed. Her name is Miss Black, and the Secretary of State can make investigation about this and see if the facts as I present them are correct.

Mr. MEIGHEN: Is that the military hospital?

Mr. SINCLAIR: Yes. This young lady was not acceptable to the patronage committee of South Cape Breton.

Mr. MEIGHEN: Is it under the Military Hospitals Commission?

Mr. SINCLAIR: I suppose so. In any event, she was not acceptable to the patronage committee of South Cape Breton, and her application was rejected, the position being given to a young lady who had no experience at all, but who had simply completed her training as a nurse, but her father was a friend of the party in power. This case is well known in the county of Cape Breton. I think we should have no trouble in giving my hon. friend a great many other cases of a similar nature. My experience in regard to the cases of any of the nurses I have been acquainted with is that they got on the force only through the recommendation of some Conservative politician, and I can give the minister specific instances of nurses making application to be put on the service whose applications lay for months in the military head office here, and there was nothing doing until they secured the recommendation of some prominent Tory supporter . That has been the system of the appointment of nurses all through the service. I do not want to bother the Secretary of State by giving him too many specific cases, but it is not fair for him to say that members on this side of the House are making general charges only, when, as a matter of fact, we have been giving him specific cases which he has not been able to explain.

Mr. MEIGHEN: I have had the explanation of one of the cases already. Perhaps it is as well to give it to the committee. I have not had time to communicate it to the acting Postmaster General. The hon. member for Prince Edward Island (Mr. McLean) tells me that what the hon. member for Richmond (Mr. Kyte) says as to Charlottetown is quite wrong, that there has been no appointment made at all to the position of postmaster at Charlottetown, that the inspector who was inspector before is doing the work along with his own work, and saving the country $2,000 a year.

Mr. GRAHAM: He will be in the estimates for extra work done. This condition of affairs will only last until after the election.

Progress reported.

SUPPLY—CONCURRENCE.

The House proceeded to consider resolutions reported from Committee of Supply.

Mr. PUGSLEY: I do not think it necessary to read all these items, but I would like to speak of one matter. There is an item for improvement work in St. John harbour, and I wish to call the attention of the Acting Minister of Public Works to what I think is a very serious state of affairs in connection with this work. There was a contract given for a large amount of work there, including the building of a dry dock. When I was minister, I exacted a security of half a million dollars. I am told that the Government has reduced the security to $250,000, and that drawbacks accumulated, and that the contractors were at work and had a large plant on the spot, worth $300,000 or $400,000, in respect of which the department would have a lien for the purpose of the work. There was also about $700,000 of cash on hand including the deposit. I understand the Government has returned to the contractors the whole $700,000, and that the contractors are now trying to get the plant released. If that is done, it will be handing over to defaulting contractors, who were under obligation to perform this work, nearly $1,000,000 which this country had a right to insist should be applied towards the completion of the work. I do not think my hon. friend is responsible, but the Government is responsible, and I would ask him to exercise the right of lien which the Government has on that plant to keep it

there until matters can be arranged for the completion of the work.

I am not going to criticise to-night anything in connection with the half million dollars; perhaps that can be satisfactorily explained. But I would ask the minister to retain control of the plant until satisfactory arrangements are made for the continuance of the work and the unravelling of all matters connected with the dry dock.

Mr. REID: The amount that was handed to the Government went to pay the creditors. With reference to the plant, I promise my hon. friend that I will take it up in the morning with the officials of the department, see what the situation is and if it is as the hon. member states we will hold it back.

Mr. PUGSLEY: If my hon. friend will look at the contract he will see that the Government has a lien on all plant brought to the work.

Resolution concurred in.

Mr. GRAHAM: I suppose that the Government will see that all these items are right. When we dispense with reading them the Government will have to take the responsibility of seeing that the details are correct.

Resolution concurred in.

WAYS AND MEANS—THE SUPPLY BILL.

On motion of Mr. Reid, the House went into committee of Ways and Means, Mr. Rainville in the chair.

Mr. Reid moved:

Resolved, that towards making good the supply granted to His Majesty on account of certain expenditures of the public service for the financial year ending March 31, 1918, the sum of $4,721,500 be granted out of the consolidated revenue fund of Canada.

Motion agreed to.

Mr. Reid moved:

Resolved, that towards making good the supply granted to His Majesty on account of certain expenditures of the public service for the financial year ending March 31, 1918, the sum of $46,375,267.75 be granted out of the consolidated revenue fund of Canada.

Motion agreed to.

Resolutions reported and concurred in.

THE SUPPLY BILL—$51,096,767.05.

Mr. Reid moved for leave to introduce Bill No. 135, for granting to His Majesty certain sums of money for the public service for the financial year ending the 31st March, 1918.

Motion agreed to, Bill read the first and second time, considered in committee, and reported.

On the motion for the third reading of the Bill:

Mr. GRAHAM: Unless there is some special reason that the Government can give us why this Bill should be read a third time to-night, it should not be read a third time. I do not want to take any objection, but to go through the first, second and third reading without taking a breath is rushing matters somewhat unless there is some special reason for it.

Mr. REID: We would like to pass it to-night to get it over to the Senate. I understand the Senate is practically through. They have passed the War-time Elections Bill and it will be here to-night.

We would like to send over to the Senate what we have on the Order Paper, so that they may have some business to-morrow. When we get through with the Bill which is coming over, we will have nothing more to do. We would like to take it up, discuss it, and be ready for prorogation to-morrow. If, by any chance, we cannot get through with the discussion, prorogation will take place the next day, but we would like to get our Bills over there in order to finish up the business.

Mr. GRAHAM: Of course, there will be some discussion on the other Bill I imagine, but before I consent to the third reading I would ask if the War-time Elections Act is back from the Senate and is to be dealt with to-night. It cannot be discussed to-morrow, unless steps are taken to-night so that it will appear on the Order Paper. Otherwise, the discussion will take place the day after to-morrow.

Mr. REID: The Bill I refer to has passed the Senate, and, as I understand, was sent over here, and will be ready for to-morrow. At all events, we would like to finish up the other business and be prepared to discuss the War-time Elections Act to-morrow. I understand that the Senate came to some arrangement by which the Bill passed there without further discussion. I admit there will be some discussion here. I have no doubt the Bill will be ready for discussion to-morrow.

Mr. GRAHAM: If I might be permitted, under the rules the Bill cannot be here for discussion at the next sitting, unless it goes through the proper stages, and is sent over

to us to-night. If it is presented to the House to-night, it will be on the Order Paper to be discussed to-morrow.

Mr. REID: I have information that the Bill will be here inside of ten minutes, so it will be on the Order Paper to-morrow; that will be arranged.

Mr. SINCLAIR: Might I suggest that the amendments should be printed, as they refer to my province. They are very intricate, and I would like to see them.

Mr. REID: Yes, they will be printed.

Motion agreed to, and Bill read the third time.

JUDGES' ACT AMENDMENT.

The House proceeded to the consideration of an amendment made by the Senate to Bill No. 66 to amend the Judges' Act.

Mr. GRAHAM: I suggest that this debate be under closure.

Mr. DOHERTY: I understood that this stood over, in order that the formal motion might properly be submitted to the House. I move:

That a message be sent to the Senate to acquaint their honours that this House disagrees to their amendment to Bill No. 66, an Act to amend the Judges' Act, for the following reasons:

Because the amendment is not relevant to the Bill, which is only to provide the salaries for two additional judges, to restrict in certain cases the travelling expenses of judges, and to extend certain provisions of the Act now applying to County Court judges to the Circuit Court of the district of Montreal;

Because, though it may be advisable to modify the pensions at present provided with respect to future appointments, it is not in the public interests that the remuneration or pensions of judges now on the Bench should be changed to their prejudice;

Because, the amendment forbids the judges to perform any duties outside their judicial duties, and that, while it may be an advantage to make more precise and definite the prohibitions at present existing, there are duties that every one is bound to perform, that so wide a prohibition is impossible for the judges to observe, and that, in any case, it is not in the public interest to enforce so unlimited a restriction.

Because there are in connection with said amendment questions of grave importance touching the independence of the judiciary, which call for the careful consideration of the House of Commons, consideration which cannot adequately be given at the present session, and because these questions can be more advantageously dealt with upon a Bill submitted for that purpose, and at a time when they can be deliberately considered.

Mr. GRAHAM: What will be the result if this motion is adopted? Where does the Bill go then?

[Mr. Graham.]

Mr. DOHERTY: It will be returned to the Senate. While I have no official information on the subject, I believe there is very good reason to believe that they will acquiesce in the soundness of these reasons, which only look to defer consideration of the important questions which arise on their amendment, which is entirely foreign to anything in the Bill.

Mr. GRAHAM: The Bill will get through?

Mr. DOHERTY: Yes.

WAR CHARITIES ACT.

House again in committee on Bill No. 130, relating to war charities, Mr. Rainville in the Chair.

Mr. GRAHAM: Is that the Act to provide for the supervision of the collection of war charges?

Mr. REID: Yes.

Mr. McKENZIE: That Bill was held over by the Minister of Finance, who has charge of it, for further information which he was to get before he would take it up again. We have never had an explanation. If it proceeds, it will go on in the absence of any information.

Mr. MEIGHEN: The Minister of Finance is confined to his room. Consequently, I made as good a study of the measure this afternoon as I could, and I read the whole debate that took place on the measure when it was in committee before. I think my hon. friend is wrong when he says there was information to come. I cannot recollect that.

Mr. McKENZIE: He held it over for some reason.

Mr. MEIGHEN: I know the reason; it was not for information. There were certain suggested amendments. It was suggested that it should be amended in three ways. First objection was taken to the title. The hon. member for Pictou (Mr. Macdonald) thought the title should be "The War Contributions Act." Secondly, the hon. member for Pictou thought it should be widened to include such contributions as machine gun contributions and the like of that, that it should be extended beyond the mere domain of benevolence. Thirdly, it was contended by the hon. member for Middlesex, and several hon. gentlemen opposite, that churches should be exempted from the operation of the Act. I do not know of any other amendment that was suggested. That was why it was

held over, and consideration was promised to those suggestions. I would prefer to see the title stay as it is. The title "War Contributions" would not definitely indicate the nature of the Bill. It is a Bill to prevent people appealing to the public for money for an unauthorized fund, or a fund which it is not in the public interest that appeals should be made for. It does not cover the whole scope of war contribution. It covers only benevolent or alleged benovelent contributions, or charitable contributions, because there is really nothing distasteful in the word "charity."

The title to be given to this Act is the same as that which has been given to the British Act; their War Charities Act is in line with this legislation. They have had their legislation since the war began; in my judgment, we should have had this sooner. The member for South Renfrew (Mr. Graham) suggested long ago that some such legislation as this should be provided. We are following in line with Britain in that regard; besides, the title "War Charities" is appropriate. As to the other idea that the Bill should cover a wider sphere, it may be that we ought to do that in separate legislation, but anything done in that regard should not be done in connection with this measure. The things we want to aim at now are appeals to the charity of the public and to the benevolence of the public for the relieving of suffering and distress. The other various schemes that were worked—some of them very laudable indeed in themselves—are now pretty much in the past; I do not think that we need look for them much more. The suggestion of hon. gentlemen opposite that churches should be excepted, is a good one. I move that section 2 be amended by adding after the word "association" in the second line the words "other than a church or the Salvation Army."

Amendment agreed to.

Mr. GLASS: There was a discussion as to the desirability of exempting an organization of a national character, such as the Daughters of the Empire. Possibly, however, if you started on one you would have to introduce quite a number of exemptions of this kind.

Mr. MEIGHEN: I do not see any need of exemptions. I do not take quite the same view of the operation of the Act as that taken by the Minister of Finance. He seemed to proceed on the assumption that any institutions that were obviously and by general acceptance right and proper and already recognized by law should be exempted. My idea is that they should be immediately registered. The Secretary of State has power to register them at once, and my first step would be to register the Daughters of the Empire, the Patriotic Fund, the Red Cross, the Belgian Relief Fund, and the like. These organizations will lead in the matter of registration.

Mr. McKENZIE: I understand that this Bill enables the minister to grant licenses for the holding of entertainments at which moneys will be collected for patriotic purposes, and that if such licenses are not issued, those responsible for the entertainment will be acting in violation of the law. I do not think that we have any jurisdiction to grant licenses for entertainments held in any of the provinces.

Mr. MEIGHEN: I do not think that my hon. friend has in his mind quite the right idea of the nature of the Bill. In the first place, we do not grant licenses. We register the fund, which is the institution that embodies the purpose of the appeal. For example, we register the Patriotic Fund; that does not mean that we license a church or a society in the country to hold a concert on behalf of the Patriotic Fund. Contributions to that fund by way of concert or entertainment are all right provided the Patriotic Fund themselves say that they are prepared to accept the contribution and that the concert or entertainment has their sanction. But we want to stop the carrying out of schemes, even in respect of the Patriotic Fund, the purpose of which is ostensibly to obtain money for the Patriotic Fund, but really to get money which goes largely to the promoters of the schemes or their friends, the Patriotic Fund getting only a negligible residue.

Mr. McKENZIE: No form of criminal ingenuity could be practised in connection with getting funds that is not a violation of the provisions of the Criminal Code. If it is stated that money received or collected will be given to one purpose and it is deliberately given to another, money is received on false pretenses. If funds are misappropriated, the persons responsible are guilty of conversion and of theft. I do not see that anything a man or woman could do in exploiting schemes of this kind in a criminal way is not covered by the provisions of the criminal law. I think that this proposed Act is an absolutely unnecessary provision.

Mr. MEIGHEN: The criminal law does not cover the cases dealt with here, so far as they have been presented to me. For example, it was advertised that at a race meeting the proceeds of the first day should go to the Patriotic Fund. As a consequence patriotically inclined people went on the first day in preference to the other days, and many who went, instead of asking for change, left their five dollars with the gatekeeper. They thought that it was all going to the Patriotic Fund; that was all they cared about it. As a consequence some $6,000 or $7,000 were taken in that day. Some difficulty ensued in getting the money; much time was taken up, and finally about $350 reached the Patriotic Fund. The rest was applied towards the expenses of the meeting, salaries and allowances to those who gave their time to it, and so on. That would not come under the Criminal Code, but no such scheme of making money for the Patriotic Fund—it was really not for the fund at all—should be allowed. It is such things as that that we want to regulate by this Bill. The secretary of the Patriotic Fund can give my hon. friend some very illuminating instances.

Mr. McKENZIE: Suppose it was advertised that the funds were to be applied to the Patriotic Fund and that the people in the light of that advertisement, went and contributed their money. That money would have been received illegally, under false pretenses, if it was not afterwards handed over to the Patriotic Fund.

Mr. MEIGHEN: The proceeds were applied to the Patriotic Fund all right, but the promoters took care that the proceeds did not amount to very much.

Mr. GLASS: I remember the argument of the hon. member for North Cape Breton (Mr. McKenzie) on that point when this matter was before the House on a previous occasion. I believe that even if the Criminal Code does provide punishment for fraudulent collection of funds of this kind, yet in these times it is a great deterrent and discouragement to funds supported by voluntary contribution if those frauds are allowed to go to a point at which action has to be taken which may ultimately result in a prosecution. The old adage that an ounce of prevention is worth a pound of cure very fitly applies to a matter of this kind, and it ought to be checked by prevention rather than by punishment after frauds have been perpetrated. For that reason I can conceive that an Act along the lines of the one before the House will more effectively meet the case than by resorting to punishment after the wrong has been done.

Sir HERBERT AMES: An Act of this kind was found to be absolutely necessary in England even after a few months of war. The general public were willing to give generously, but they were very susceptible, the result being that they were easily exploited. We had the same experience in Canada. One of the things that must be conserved in this war, quite as much as provisions or money, is the generous impulse of our people. We must not allow them to be exploited, because there is only a certain amount of voluntary generous impulse in the country. If that is drawn off and misused, there is so much less for legitimate enterprise. I can give to this House any number of instances that have come within the experience of the Canadian Patriotic Fund, in which we have seen the well-intentioned generosity of the Canadian people deliberately diverted and wasted on war funds. This Bill has a double purpose. First of all, it purposes protecting the public against fraudulent, unwise, injudicious collection of money for so-called war charities, and, secondly, we want it very much in order to protect the legitimate funds, to make it possible for the legitimate funds to defend themselves.

The National Canadian Patriotic Fund will be one of the first to ask to be registered. It will be the easiest thing in the world for that fund to conform with all the regulations that are required. They have to prove that they are administered by a responsible committee; that they keep regular minutes of their meetings; that they have proper books, and that their income and outgo are properly checked. They have to show that they bank their money, and that they use the authorized forms of the department. The National Canadian Patriotic Fund, the Belgian Fund, and the Red Cross Fund, through their organizations, will come and be certificated. Their certificates will apply not only to the national fund, but to all the branches. Each of the branches in its respective locality has, to some extent, the same powers that the parent organization has, and what will happen will be just this: If a city organization undertakes to raise money for the Patriotic Fund they will have to obtain permission from the local branch in order to do so. The local branch can say to those people: That is not the proper way in which to go to work for the Patriotic Fund; a large percentage of the amount

collected will be wasted. We had in Vancouver a case in which they got up a large contribution contrary to the desire of the local branch of the Patriotic Fund. They raised $1,500 and paid out $1,400 in expenses. That was a pure waste of benevolent effort. The various funds of this country are entitled to protect themselves against misdirected effort.

Bill as amended reported, amendments read the first and second time and concurred in, and Bill read the third time and passed.

On the motion of Hon. Mr. Reid, the House adjourned at 1.40 a.m. Thursday.

Thursday, September 20, 1917.

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

CANADIAN EXPEDITIONARY FORCE.

STATEMENT BY PRIME MINISTER AS TO SUGGESTED HOLIDAY.

Right Hon. Sir ROBERT BORDEN (Prime Minister): The hon. member for Russell (Hon. Charles Murphy) made an inquiry in the House a few days ago with respect to a press report that Australia had made arrangements to send 50,000 members of the original Australian Expeditionary Force to their homes for rest. I addressed a telegram on the same day to Sir George Perley in the following terms:

> Press telegram reports Australia has made arrangements to send fifty thousand of original Australian Expeditionary Force home for a rest irrespective whether corresponding reinforecments are sent from Australia. Question as to this has been asked in House of Commons. Please report soon as possible whether press statement has any and what foundation.

To which I received a reply yesterday as follows:

> Australian High Commissioner's office states question of returning original Australian Expeditionary Force was raised in Australian House but no instructions have come to Australian headquarters, London, regarding such return and High Commissioner's office not aware of any action taken to effectuate it.

Mr. MURPHY: The other part of my question was whether such steps as those suggested were to be taken with reference to the Canadian Expeditionary Force.

Sir ROBERT BORDEN: No such steps have been taken.

QUESTIONS.

(Questions answered orally are indicated by asterisks.)

MATTRESSES AND COVERS.

Mr. A. K. MACLEAN:

1. To whom was the contract awarded for the supply of 1,700 mattresses and 2,900 covers under tenders asked for in February last, and maturing on Thursday, February 22, 1917?
2. What was the price?

Sir EDWARD KEMP: Stand.

Mr. A. K. MACLEAN: This question has been on the Order Paper now for several days. The facts to be ascertained must have been known for some weeks, even months. Why has the question not been answered?

Sir EDWARD KEMP: If the hon. member had asked how many mattresses and covers had been purchased by the Department of Militia and Defence, the question would have been answered in due course. But, as the question is put, it has been necessary to go to every department of the Government for information. The Militia Department have already answered the question in the regular way and sent the reply to the proper officer of the Government.

Mr. A. K. MACLEAN: The question refers to a specific tender for the supplying of specific goods; there was no need of any rushing from one department to the other. Reference to the advertisement issued by the department would have indicated the officer possessing the information.

Sir ROBERT BORDEN: My hon. friend is mistaken about that. When a question is asked in this form it must go to every department of the Government, because it does not appear on its face to what department it relates. It is possible that the Militia Department had or had not such a tender, but that does not dispose of the question by any means.

Mr. A. K. MACLEAN: My attention might have been directed to that on a previous occasion, or I might have been asked privately to supply the necessary information. The question has reference to the Militia Department.

Sir EDWARD KEMP: Similar cases occur very frequently when questions are called.

Mr. A. K. MACLEAN: I will complain no further if I have the assurance that the answer will be sent to my address.

Sir EDWARD KEMP: I shall be very glad to give my hon. friend the information

so far as the Militia Department is concerned.

LIEUT. M. J. HOWE.

Mr. OLIVER:

1. Is Lieutenant M. J. Howe, formerly of the 188th Battalion, still in the service of the Militia Department?
2. If so, what are his duties, pay and allowances?

Sir EDWARD KEMP:

1. No.
2. Answered by No. 1.

CAPTAIN DOUGLAS, M.P.

Mr. DAVIDSON:

1. Did Captain J. M. Douglas, M.P., enlist or receive a commission in the Canadian Expeditionary Forces?
2. If so, when and where and in what branch of the service?
3. What rank did he hold?
4. Is he still a member of the Canadian Expeditionary Forces? If not, when did the term of his services cease?
5. For what period and where was he in training, was his training completed and what time, if any, did he serve at the front in France or elsewhere?
6. At what rate per diem has he been paid, and have any of his dependents drawn separation allowance?
7. What amount has been paid to date on both accounts?

Sir EDWARD KEMP:

1. No.

2, 3, 4, 5, 6 and 7. Answered by No. 1.

LIEUTENANT CARROLL, M.P.

Mr. DAVIDSON:

1. Did Lieutenant W. F. Carroll, M.P., for Cape Breton South, enlist or receive a commission in the Canadian Expeditionary Forces?
2. If so, when and where and in what branch of the service?
3. What rank did he hold?
4. Is he still a member of the Canadian Expeditionary Forces? If not, when did the term of his services cease?
5. For what period and where was he in training, was his training completed and what time, if any, did he serve at the front in France or elsewhere?
6. At what rate per diem has he been paid, and have any of his dependents drawn separation allowance?
7. What amount has been paid to date on both accounts?

Sir EDWARD KEMP:

1. Yes.

2. March 4, 1916; Military District No. 6, infantry; 185th Battalion; 193rd Battalion

3. Private, sergeant and lieutenant.

4. Yes.

5. March 4 to October 12, 1916, in Canada; sailed for overseas October 12, 1916; returned to Canada January 9, 1917

6. Pay and allowances were drawn by Lieut. W. F. Carroll, at the following rates for the periods named: March 4, 1916, to March 31, 1916, as private; April 1, 1916, to July 20, 1916, as sergeant; July 21, 1916, to January 31, 1917, as lieutenant.

7. Total pay and allowances drawn in Canada, $441.83. Cable sent overseas for total paid there. Total separation allowances from March 4, 1916, to January 31, 1917, $299.

CAPTAIN NEELY, M.P.

Mr. DAVIDSON:

1. Did Captain D. B. Neely, M.P., for Humbolt, enlist or receive a commission in the Canadian Expeditionary Forces?
2. If so, when and where and in what branch of the service?
3. What rank did he hold?
4. Is he still a member of the Canadian Expeditionary Forces? If not, when did the term of his services cease?
5. For what period and where was he in training, was his training completed and what time, if any, did he serve at the front in France or elsewhere?
6. At what rate per diem has he been paid, and have any of his dependents drawn separation allowance?
7. What amount has been paid to date on both accounts?

Sir EDWARD KEMP:

1. Yes.

2. August 13, 1915; Military District No. 10; 10th Overseas Canadian Mounted Rifles and Army Medical Corps.

3. Captain.

4. Yes.

5. (a) Proceeded overseas immediately as Army Medical Corps reinforcement. (b) No.

6. August 13, 1915, to January 22, 1917; March 1, 1917, to May 8, 1917. Pay of rank in Canadian Expeditionary Force at captain's rates.

7. No pay drawn in Canada. (Cable sent overseas to ascertain total paid there.) Separation allowance at captain's rates for above mentioned period; total, $784.

CAPT. ELLIS, M.P.P.

Mr. DAVIDSON:

1. Did Captain J. F. Ellis, M.P.P., enlist or receive a commission in the Canadian Expeditionary Forces?
2. If so, when and where and in what branch of the service?
3. What rank did he hold?
4. Is he still a member of the Canadian Expeditionary Forces? If not, when did the term of his services cease?
5. For what period and where was he in training, was his training completed and what time, if any, did he serve at the front in France or elsewhere?
6. At what rate per diem has he been paid, and have any of his dependents drawn separation allowance?
7. What amount has been paid to date on both accounts?

Sir EDWARD KEMP:

1. Yes.

2. 8th April, 1916; Military District No. 6, Halifax; Army Medical Corps.

3. Captain.

4. Yes.

5. Proceeded overseas with a draft as reinforcement.

6. April 11, 1916, to May 31, 1916, pay and allowances of Captain, Canadian Expeditionary Force.

7. Total while in Canada, $267.75. Proceeded overseas May, 1916. (Cable sent overseas to ascertain amount paid there.) Separation allowances, 11th April, 1916, to 30th September, 1917, at $40 per month; total to date, $706.

MAJOR RALSTON, M.P.P.

Mr. DAVIDSON:

1. Did Major J. L. Ralston, M.P.P., enlist or receive a commission in the Canadian Expeditionary Forces?

2. If so, when and where and in what branch of the service?

3. What rank did he hold?

4. Is he still a member of the Canadian Expeditionary Forces? If not, when did the term of his services cease?

5. For what period and where was he in training, was his training completed and what time, if any, did he serve at the front in France or elsewhere?

6. At what rate per diem has he been paid, and have any of his dependents drawn separation allowance?

7. What amount has been paid to date on both accounts?

Sir EDWARD KEMP:

1. Yes.

2. 14th January, 1916; Halifax, Infantry, 85th Battalion, Canadian Expeditionary Force.

3. Lieutenant, 27th September, 1915; Captain; Captain and Adjutant; Major.

4. Yes.

5. 27th September, 1915, to 12th October, 1916, date of sailing. Reported wounded 28th June, 1917.

6. September 27, 1915, to November 11, Lieutenant's pay of rank and allowances. November 12, 1915, to September 28, 1916, Captain's pay and allowances, September 29, 1916 to date—Major's pay and allowances.

7. Total pay and allowances received up to time of sailing, namely, 1st October, 1916, $1,760.05; total separation allowance to date, $1,070. (Cable sent overseas to obtain total pay and allowances from 1st October, 1916, to date.)

MR. A. W. NIXON, M.L.A.

Mr. PROULX:

1. Did Alfred Westland Nixon, M.L.A. for Halton, enlist or receive a commission in the Canadian Expeditionary Forces?

2. If so, when and where and in what branch of the service?

3. What rank did he hold?

4. Is he still a member of the Canadian Expeditionary Forces? If not, when did the term of his services cease?

5. For what period and where was he in training, was his training completed and what time, if any, did he serve at the front in France or elsewhere?

6. At what rate per diem has he been paid, and have any of his dependents drawn separation allowance?

7. What amount has been paid to date on both accounts?

Sir EDWARD KEMP:

1. No.

2, 3, 4, 5, 6 and 7. Answered by No. 1.

THE QUEBEC BRIDGE.

CENTRE SPAN PLACED IN POSITION.

Sir ROBERT BORDEN: The following memorandum has just been placed in my hands:

A Quebec despatch says the centre span of the Quebec bridge is in position, and is being attached to the cantilever arms.

Some hon. MEMBERS: Hear, hear.

RECRUITS AND CASUALTIES.

Mr. SINCLAIR:

1. What was the total number of recruits enlisted in the Canadian Expeditionary Forces since August 1, 1916?

2. What was the total number of casualties in the Canadian Expeditionary Forces since August 1, 1916, classified as killed in action, died of wounds, died of sickness, presumed dead, missing, wounded, and prisoners of war?

3. What is the estimated average percentage of wounded who subsequently return to active service?

Sir EDWARD KEMP: Stand.

Mr. SINCLAIR: This is a very important question. Have I the assurance of the minister that the information will be given later?

Sir EDWARD KEMP: The information will be forthcoming shortly.

CORRECTION—Mr. PUGSLEY.

On the Orders of the Day:

Hon. WILLIAM PUGSLEY (St. John City): I wish to correct a statement which I am reported to have made yesterday, and which appears on page 6384 of Hansard. I assume that the error occurred because my language was not clear. I read a resolu-

tion adopted by the Great War Veterans' Association of St. John, and during the course of my remarks I referred to the fact that a certain number of gentlemen held positions—the report says "in St. John," but what I intended to say—and what I think I did say—was in "Military District No. 6."

Mr. REID: I remember that the hon. gentleman said "St. John."

Mr. PUGSLEY: Did I? Then I made a mistake. I should have said Military District No. 6, in the Maritime Provinces. I wish to correct that error.

PRINTING OF ELECTORAL LISTS.

On the Orders of the Day:

Mr. A. K. MACLEAN (Halifax): May I ask the Prime Minister whether the Nova Scotia voters' lists as last revised by the province will be printed and furnished to candidates, including defeated candidates, as required by the provision of Part 1 of the Dominion Elections Act? It would be a very great advantage to all parties to have this information. It is true that the lists will be somewhat revised; still, a great deal of work would be saved if the provisions of the law were carried out.

Sir ROBERT BORDEN: My hon. friend asked a similar question the other day. I communicated with the Clerk of the Crown in Chancery and expected to have a reply from him. I believe that such a reply has been prepared, but it has not yet reached me. Part 1 of the Dominion Elections Act is suspended for the purposes of this election; therefore the provisions which requires the printing of voting lists are suspended because they are in that part of the Act, and are not elsewhere to be found. My hon. friend, however, has put it on the ground not of legal obligation, but of convenience. I should not care to give a definite reply at the moment, but I shall discuss the subject with the Secretary of State and give the best consideration that may be possible to what my hon. friend suggests.

NOVA SCOTIA ELECTORAL LISTS.

On the Orders of the Day:

Mr. A. K. MACLEAN (Halifax): I would suggest to the Prime Minister that when the Military Voters' Act and the War-Time Elections Act are printed, a considerable number of copies be sent to the members so that they shall not be obliged to write to Ottawa for them.

Sir ROBERT BORDEN: I think that is an entirely reasonable request.

Sir WILFRID LAURIER: May I, in this connection, suggest to my right hon. friend that the lists which are now in force in the four eastern provinces of Quebec, New Brunswick, Nova Scotia and Prince Edward Island, should be distributed, because the number of those whose names will be taken off those lists is very limited. Apart from the number in one or perhaps two cities, the number of those who will be disfranchised can be counted upon the fingers of one hand. If we had copies of the lists of those provinces, it would be a great advantage to us.

Sir ROBERT BORDEN: I shall give my best attention to the suggestion of my right hon. friend.

EXEMPTIONS UNDER MILITARY SERVICE ACT.

On the Orders of the Day:

Hon. RODOLPHE LEMIEUX (Rouville): Has the Prime Minister had time to read carefully the letter written by the Deputy Speaker to his constituents in regard to the exemptions under the Military Service Act? If so, does his letter exactly represent the opinion of the Government?

Sir ROBERT BORDEN: I regret to say that, in the hurry of many affairs at the end of the session, I have not been able to give very close attention to the letter which has been spoken of, and I can only repeat what I said on a previous occasion when the subject was referred to me, that the regulations have not yet been formulated or presented to the Government. They are under consideration now by the Military Service Council, over which the Deputy Minister of Justice presides, and which is composed of Mr. O. M. Biggar, of Edmonton; Mr. J. H. Moss, of Toronto; Mr. Louis Loranger, of Montreal, and Lieutenant Colonel H. A. C. Machin, of Kenora. They have been for some time engaged in the preparation of the regulations. I believe it is their intention, if possible, to include in the regulations which are to have the approval of the Central Appeal Judge all regulations that may be made under the statute. That is their present intention, if it is practicable. There are certain regulations which must be approved by the Central Appeal Judge; there are certain other regulations which

do not require that approval, but I understand that, if possible, all the regulations to be made are to have the approval of the Central Appeal Judge. Until those regulations have been presented to the Government and confirmed by Order in Council, there is nothing authoritative about the matter at all.

Mr. LEMIEUX: As this is a matter of the gravest importance, because the people in my constituency, at all events, are led to believe that no sons of farmers will be called out, am I to conclude, from what my right hon. friend has said, that nothing has been yet decided?

Sir ROBERT BORDEN: The regulations, as I have already stated, have not been presented to the Government by the Military Service Council. I do not know whether they have been placed before the Central Appeal Judge. Until they have been placed before and approved by the Governor in Council there is nothing authoritative about the matter at all.

MEDICAL EXAMINERS UNDER MILITARY SERVICE ACT.

On the Orders of the Day:

Mr. EDMUND PROULX (Prescott): Is it the intention of the Minister of Militia to appoint medical examiners in each constituency to examine men between the ages of twenty and thirty-four who wish to present themselves for medical examination?

Sir EDWARD KEMP: Medical examiners under the Military Service Act will be appointed at certain mobilization centres which are to be determined upon and which will cover the whole country.

STAFF OF OVERSEAS DEPARTMENT OF MILITIA.

On the Orders of the Day:

Mr. E. M. MACDONALD (Pictou): Might I ask the Minister of Militia if he has not with him to-day the information I requested as to the number of officers, non-commissioned officers and men employed in the Department of Militia Overseas, if he would be good enough to send the information to me?

Sir EDWARD KEMP: There are 141 officers employed or attached to the Department of Militia overseas in the various departments and offices. There are 492 non-commissioned officers and men, not including civilian employees, so employed. The total amount paid per month for salaries to such officers and men is not available at the moment.

DEATH OF THE SERJEANT-AT-ARMS.

REFERENCES BY RT. HON. SIR ROBERT BORDEN AND RT. HON. SIR WILFRID LAURIER TO THE LATE COLONEL HENRY R. SMITH.

On the Orders of the Day:

Right Hon. Sir ROBERT BORDEN: I have to announce to the House, with very deep regret, that Col. Henry Robert Smith, Serjeant-at-Arms, died this morning. The son of a distinguished Speaker of the old Parliament of Canada, he was appointed Deputy Serjeant-at-Arms in 1872 and promoted to be Serjeant-at-Arms in 1892. He has, therefore, served as deputy and as Serjeant-at-Arms for nearly half a century. Col. Smith had also a very considerable military service, in 1866 and 1872 on the frontier, and in 1885 in the North-west Rebellion. Those of us who have known him in the course of his important official duties have, I am sure, been impressed with the dignity and courtesy with which he discharged them. He was, in a word, a fine type of a gentleman of the old school and his passing away is a distinct loss to the public life of this country. He was a man of much culture, having a very wide acquaintance with English literature, and altogether he was a most interesting personality. I am sure all the members of the House will join with me in an expression of profound sympathy to all the members of his family.

Right Hon. Sir WILFRID LAURIER: It is with as much regret as that of my right hon. friend that I learned of the sudden death of Colonel Smith. To me, personally, who am now one of the oldest members of this House, the death of Colonel Smith causes me very keen sorrow. Too much praise cannot be given to our late friend. As every hon. member knows, he was one of the best servants we ever had. He was a man of the strictest integrity, of the highest sense of honour, and of unfailing courtesy. It is not too much to say that he had endeared himself to every member of the House who had anything to do with the management of public business.

THE CLERK OF THE HOUSE.

RETIREMENT OF DR. FLINT, WHO BY RESOLUTION OF THE HOUSE IS ACCORDED THE PRIVILEGE OF A SEAT AT THE TABLE ON OCCASIONS OF CEREMONY.

Right Hon. Sir ROBERT BORDEN: An intimation has been already conveyed to the House that the Clerk of the House pur-

poses retiring from the duties of his office, which he has discharged for some fifteen years. Previous to his acceptance of the office which he now holds, Dr. Flint had a distinguished career in Parliament and in the public life of the country, and since he undertook the responsibilities of the important office of Clerk of the House, all of the members who have come in contact with him have appreciated the ability, zeal, and industry which he has uniformly displayed in the discharge of his duties.

I desire to express my own personal recognition of his uniform courtesy and his unfailing attention to all matters which I have had to bring to his notice in the ten years which I served as leader of the Opposition, and in the six years which I have had imposed upon me the responsibilities of First Minister.

I feel perfectly confident that my right hon. friend the leader of the Opposition will join with me in proposing a resolution which I am sure will meet with universal acceptance by all the members of this House. It is my privilege to move, seconded by Sir Wilfrid Laurier:

That in view of the long and faithful services of Doctor Thomas B. Flint, Clerk of the House of Commons, he be continued after his retirement an honorary officer of this House, and that he be allowed the entree of the House of Commons and a seat at the Table on occasions of ceremony.

Right hon. Sir WILFRID LAURIER: Mr. Speaker, in view of the fact that we are to lose the services of Doctor Flint, I second this motion with very great pleasure. I join cordially in everything that has been said by my right hon. friend in appreciation of the services of Doctor Flint, and I am sure that in his remarks he only expressed what is felt by everybody. Doctor Flint has been not only attentive but indefatigable in the discharge of his duties towards both parties in this House. As an old personal friend, I regret more than I can say that the condition of his health forces him to the relinquishment of the duties he has so well performed. I am sure that I reflect the feelings of all when I express the hope that his health may be restored, and that he may long be spared to move amongst us.

THE WAR-TIME ELECTIONS ACT.

CANDIDATES FOR THE HOUSE OF COMMONS SERVING ON TRIBUNALS.

On the Orders of the Day:

Mr. F. F. PARDEE (West Lambton): May I be permitted to draw the attention of the Secretary of State to something which may not have been intended in the last revision of the Franchise Act. Paragraph (g) of section 70 of the Dominion Elections Act provides that:

Every person accepting or holding any office, commission or employment, permanent or temporary, in the service of the Government of Canada at the nomination of the Crown or at the nomination of any of the officers of the Government of Canada,

—shall be debarred from offering himself as a candidate for the Federal House. By the Act of 1915 to amend the Senate and House of Commons Act it is provided that serving in the naval and military forces of Canada and receiving emolument therefor shall not render a man ineligible as a member of the House of Commons. Now the question arises whether under the last revision of the Franchise Act any member or candidate to the House of Commons would be disqualified if he accepted a position on any of the tribunals and received his expenses therefor. I think that point ought to be taken into consideration, and the Act amended so as not to disqualify any person undertaking that work.

Sir ROBERT BORDEN: My impression is that there is nothing in the Dominion Elections Acts which affects the matter one way or the other. The statute to which my hon. friend alludes is the one relating to the Senate and the House of Commons. Therefore, I would not consider that any legislation passed at this session has any bearing upon the question which my hon. friend has raised. However, his observations will appear in Hansard, and I shall direct the attention of the law officers of the Crown to the point which has been raised, and if there has been any omission or oversight it could probably be corrected under the War Measures Act, after consultation with my right hon. friend who leads the Opposition.

WAR-TIME ELECTIONS ACT.

POLLING DIVISIONS.

On the Orders of the Day:

Mr. A. K. MACLEAN (Halifax): My attention has been called to the fact that under section 27, Part 1 of the Dominion Elections Act, the federal authorities had power to divide the constituencies of British Columbia into polling divisions. Part 1 of the Dominion Elections Act is now suspended, and it has been suggested to me that there is no power vested in any authority to divide British Columbia into polling divisions. I mention this to the Secretary of State now because it may be

important, and it will give him an opportunity of looking into the matter.

Hon. ARTHUR MEIGHEN (Secretary of State): As I understand it, by the War-Time Elections Act, it is made the duty of every returning officer to divide his constituency into geographical polling divisions. That applies everywhere throughout Canada.

Mr. CARVELL: Would it apply to a province like New Brunswick or Nova Scotia where, by statute, the country is already divided into polling divisions?

Mr. MEIGHEN: The Act covers the point clearly, I think. My recollection is that the discretion of the returning officer is exercisable only in the western provinces. I do not know whether it is exercisable in New Brunswick or not, but I do know that the returning officer is directed in every case to utilize the polling divisions already established, unless for some reason they cannot be utilized.

Mr. CARVELL: That was my view of it, but I wanted to have the opinion of the Secretary of State on Hansard. I did not imagine the returning officer would have the right to interfere with polling divisions in provinces like New Brunswick and Nova Scotia.

WAR-TIME ELECTIONS ACT.

FEMALE ENUMERATORS.

On the Orders of the Day:

Sir HERBERT AMES (St. Antoine): Is there anything in the War-Time Elections Act to prevent women from being appointed as enumerators?

Mr. PUGSLEY: It raises the old question whether she is a person.

Mr. MEIGHEN: I do not think that the section relating to enumerators used any particular word, but whether it does or not, I do not hesitate to give the opinion—I know that it is generally unwise to give legal opinions on cross-examination in the House of Commons, but I feel sure of my ground in this case—that it would be quite within the law to appoint a woman as enumerator.

WAR-TIME ELECTIONS ACT.

AMENDMENTS MADE BY THE SENATE CONCURRED IN AFTER FURTHER AMENDMENT.

The House proceeded to the consideration of amendments made by the Senate to Bill No. 133, The War-time Elections Act.

Sir ROBERT BORDEN: Mr. Speaker, a number of amendments of a more or less important character have been made by the Senate to this Bill. I understand that so far as those amendments are concerned they are not likely to be of a controversial nature, provided the motion which I am now about to make should commend itself to the judgment of the House. There has been a conference with respect to those amendments between gentlemen on both sides of the House, and as the result of those conferences I now beg to move, seconded by Hon. Mr. Meighen:

That the Senate amendments to Bill No. 133 be concurred in, subject to amendment of such amendments as follow:

(a) By striking out of paragraph 2 of subsection 5 of the new section 65A, provided by said Bill, the word "made" and inserting instead in each case the word "completed" as said word appears in lines 19 and 21 of page 1162 of Votes and Proceedings of the House of Commons.

(b) By striking out of said paragraph 2 of said subsection 5 of section 65A provided by said Bill the words "except the issuance in any necessary case of a certificate in form W3 under paragraph (g) of section 67," which words appear in the 33rd, 34th and 35th lines of said Votes and Proceedings.

I shall ask the Secreary of State to make any explanation that may be desired of the other amendments. So far as these were concerned, they were brought to my attention this morning by the hon. member for Pictou (Mr. Macdonald) and by my colleague from Halifax (Mr. A. K. Maclean). I think there is very good reason for the amendment because, as was pointed out to me the use of the word "completed" gives a definite date, whereas the use of the word "made" does not give a precisely definite date under the law of Nova Scotia in respect of which this amendment is made. In regard to the other amendment, it was represented to me by the hon. gentlemen I have mentioned that, under the special provisions which are made for the province of Nova Scotia, it is neither desirable nor necessary that there should be any further action by the enumerators. I concur in that view. The result of that would be that those lists having been revised under judicial sanction will stand and the enumerator will have no further duty to perform with regard to them. It seemed to me that amendment was a reasonable one, and, therefore, after the conference to which I have alluded, I thought we might accept the amendments made by the Senate, with the further amendments that are em-

bodied in the resolution I have just proposed.

Mr. SPEAKER: Is it the pleasure of the House to adopt the motion?

Sir WILFRID LAURIER: I do not rise to a point of order, but I would like to call your attention, Mr. Speaker, and the attention of the House, to the fact that whenever an amendment is brought from the Senate to be concurred in by this House, the practice has been not to take it into consideration the day it is brought down. I will not raise the point to-day, as apparently there has been an understanding between the two sides of the House.

Mr. A. K. MACLEAN: While the Senate amendments to the War Franchise Act were the subject of conference between hon. gentlemen on each side of the House, yet it was expressly understood that hon. gentlemen on this side of the House attending the conference were not to be understood as concurring in the amendments in principle. I desire to address the House just briefly in respect of those amendments. I shall not take up much time, because I understand the House is to prorogue very shortly. It is unseemly, as well as unjust, that when we are momentarily expecting the serjeant-at-arms of the Senate to knock at the doors of this chamber, commanding hon. gentlemen to attend as a body in the Senate to hear Parliament prorogue, and practically dissolve, that we should be asked to consider an amendment to this Bill which vitally affects the franchise system of one province. I do not think such a thing has ever been done before. The franchise has always been regarded very solemnly, and when additions or amendments were made thereto ample time would be given to their consideration. It is a very delicate matter, indeed, to attempt changes in the franchise law of any country at any time, but it is most objectionable to attempt amendments to that important part of our laws in the closing days of a session, and particularly when these amendments have been proposed in the Senate, and not in this chamber under the auspices of the Government. I want to protest against this legislation. I say it is in principle abominable, as were the motives which prompted its introduction. The whole thing is outrageous and unnecessary, and, besides, it is a cruel exercise of the powers of the majority of this Parliament. I understand quite well, as do all hon. members upon this side of the House, that the Government can well pass this legislation in a very few hours by resorting to the closure rule. The main part of the Bill passed this chamber under closure, and consequently all hon. gentlemen on this side of the House can now do is to register their solemn protest against the Senate amendment.

I do not assent to the proposition that this Bill is being amended for the purpose of correcting defects in the franchise law of Nova Scotia. The motive behind the introduction of the amendment must have been absolutely and purely a political one. The majority of this Parliament can only seek and desire some political advantage, else this amendment would not have been introduced in the way it was.

Had the Government been desirous of amending the Nova Scotia Franchise Act, as is virtually now proposed it would have introduced these provisions into the Bill upon its second reading. If they had that in mind then, probably they decided that it would be tactically preferable to attempt to amend the Bill in the Senate and not in the House of Commons. If that is the position, it is an objectionable one. If it was, in the judgment of the Government, desirable, for the purposes of the next general election, to establish a new Federal Franchise law for Nova Scotia, they should have introduced the amendment in this House. If that was not their desire, then the only other inference is that they succumbed to the solicitations of members from Nova Scotia supporting the Government and unwillingly capitulated to them. I consider this amendment is Government legislation, notwithstanding the fact that it reaches us at this moment in the shape of an amendment proposed by the Senate.

If they were proposing this amendment for the purpose of establishing a new Federal Franchise Act applicable to all provinces, there might be something to say in favour of it. But it is unfair and unjust at this stage of the session to attempt to establish just for one province a Federal Franchise Act—for that is what this amendment means. It is true that the War-time Elections Act deals very considerably with the franchise systems of the several provinces, but a reason was given in each case for any interference with any of the provincial franchise systems. When the War-time Elections Act was being introduced by the Secretary of State he said—Hansard, page 5726:

> By this Act the machinery which heretofore has been applicable only to the provinces of Alberta and Saskatchewan is made applicable to all those provinces where the present lists

are such that new lists are necessary; namely to the four western provinces of British Columbia, Alberta, Saskatchewan and Manitoba and as well to Prince Edward Island. It was impossible to use any lists to be found in those provinces and consequently the machinery which has been in force for twelve years as to the provision of lists in Alberta and Saskatchewan is made applicable to the other three provinces.

Therefore, in so far as the franchise laws of the four western provinces and Prince Edward Island are concerned, the interference is justified upon the ground that in those provinces there were no lists available which could be used in the forthcoming election. That may or may not have been a good reason, but at least it was a pretence of some justification for the legislation in so far as these other provinces are affected. On that point the Secretary of State spoke as follows:

The lists so made up of male voters all judicially revised in Ontario and Quebec and revised by the provincial methods in Nova Scotia and New Brunswick, are by this Bill adopted, so far as they go. The only requirement as to them is to add such of the women as by this Bill are to be entitled to vote and to substract such of the men, if any, as, by reason of alienage, should not be entitled to vote. This is done by means of a system of enumeration similar to that adopted in the other provinces. The names of women are enumerated along the lines of the present Ontario Act. I am not speaking now of the cities of Ontario; I shall ask hon. members to keep the cities of Ontario until I get through with the counties of Ontario and with the provinces of Quebec, New Brunswick and Nova Scotia. As regards these latter the lists are adopted and the enumeration only goes to the adding of the names of the additional women now entitled to vote and to the striking off of those who by reason of alienage, and nothing else, are disentitled to vote. That is the province and duty of the registrars or enumerators, whatever you call them, and that alone.

When the Secretary of State introduced the War-time Elections Act he expressly stated that it was not the intention of the Government, by the Bill, to interfere in the slightest degree with the lists for Nova Scotia as provincially made except in so far as they had to be amended for the purpose of adding women qualified under that Bill and striking off the names of aliens who were disqualified under the Bill. When the Bill was presented to the House we had the assurance of the Government that there was no intention of departing from the lists of Nova Scotia prepared under provincial legislation save in the ways I have stated. That being the policy of the Government on that occasion, the Secretary of State should ask this House to decline to accept the amendment offered by the Senate. The Government, the other day very unwillingly expressed their assent to the amendment made to the Income Tax Bill by the Senate. They took great care to have it recorded in the proceedings of this House that, while they were accepting the amendment of the Senate in that respect, it should not be construed as an acknowledgment of the power and jurisdiction of the Senate to amend such a Bill. The War-time Elections Act is just as important as the Income Tax Bill. If the Government propose accepting this amendment of the Senate, they should take care to state in the proceedings of the House that they do not acknowledge this as within the competence or jurisdiction of the Senate. Further, I am surprised that the Secretary of State intends, without a protest to submit to the amendment proposed by the Senate in direct opposition to the Bill as proposed by him on its second reading.

There is, in my judgment, only one explanation of it, and that is that the Government were a party to the play that this amendment would not be offered in this Chamber when the Bill was in progress on its second reading or in committee. It was reserved for amendment in this regard in the other Chamber where it was supposed that such an amendment might be more safely attempted. I protest, as I believe the electors of my province will protest, against singling out one province of the Confederation and establishing there a Federal Franchise Act, which is not done in any other province. The electoral list in New Brunswick which will be used at the forthcoming election was prepared under a provincial law, and revised by officers appointed by the municipal authorities or by the provincial Government of that province, and still no effort is made to amend the Bill in so far as the province of New Brunswick is concerned. I ask the members of the Government, why was that done? Can there be any answer? The ground is advanced that the appeal work in connection with the revision of the lists in Nova Scotia is done by the sheriff and not by a judge. But the lists in New Brunswick are not finally revised by any judicial body; there is no appeal of any kind there; the appeal board is constituted by municipal authority acting jointly with the Government;—as, I understand it, the municipal authorities appoint two of a board of three and the Government appoint the remaining member. If this amendment was based upon any principle it would have been been made applicable to every province of this Dominion: the

Government would have attempted the establishment of a Federal Franchise Act applicable to every province of Canada. At least it would surely have been applied to the province of New Brunswick and to other provinces where there is not, in whole or in part, something approaching a judicial revision of the list. Only one inference can be drawn; that is that this amendment was designed for the purpose of gaining a political advantage in the province of Nova Scotia, and why that one province should be singled out for this purpose is something I cannot understand. I register my protest against it. I say we have a system of revision of lists in Nova Scotia that is as good as that in any other province, if not better. That revision was last completed in March last. As hon. gentlemen know, it requires a great deal of labour on the part of members of Parliament and of political organizations to obtain a revision of voters' lists annually. That list in Nova Scotia was completed but a few months ago. Nobody in my province was complaining about the revision. I venture to say that no protest or complaint was lodged with the Government by any responsible person living in my province against that revision. I say that this amendment does not originate from anybody except the members from my province supporting the Government, and their only motive in suggesting and supporting such an amendment in the Senate and its passage through this House is a political one. In December next we shall be obliged to commence a revision of our lists again, and concurrently with the forthcoming election members of Parliament in my province will be obliged to undergo the expense, anxiety and labour of carrying on a revision of the lists, something which has never occurred before. Where the system of electoral revision by enumerators is in vogue and where that has been the practice and the established system, it may not be so objectionable; but it is objectionable to my province, and I believe that will be the judgment of everybody in it, both Liberal and Conservative. Therefore I say it entails an unnecessary amount of labour and expense upon everybody, after having undergone, just two or three months ago, a revision of our lists, to be obliged to undergo the same thing in the course of another month or two. And what for? Just to gratify the unwholesome, the unjust, desires of some hon. gentlemen opposite. Because they think they can gain some personal and political advantage in the forthcoming election we must go through a vast amount of work and incur a considerable expense. In the end very few names will be added to the electoral lists outside of women, and very few will be struck off outside of those struck off for reason of alienage. I venture the prediction that when this Bill becomes law and the revision takes place under this amendment, hon. gentlemen opposite who are responsible for this amendment will regret that they ever promoted such legislation. Further than that, I say that it adds to the burdens placed upon candidates in this election. There is that immense soldiers' vote to be taken care of, which requires a vast amount of organization and expense on the part of all candidates. Then we have the enfranchisement of women voters in all the provinces, and that entails vast labour and expense. One would think that that would be sufficient additional burden to throw upon candidates and party organizations in this election, without introducing this further complication at this particular moment.

4 p.m.

I understand that this legislation is justified upon the ground that in Nova Scotia the appeal from the work of the revisers is to the sheriffs, who are political officers appointed by the Government of Nova Scotia. Complaint is made that the appeal should be heard by a judicial officer and not by such an officer as a sheriff. At least I have heard that presented as a justification for this amendment. I say it is not a sound reason and will not be received as such in the province of Nova Scotia by any considerable number on either side of politics. Our lists are prepared by municipal officers who are called revisers. These revisers are appointed by the municipal councils or county councils, because the municipality practically corresponds geographically with our county lines. In some of the counties the majorities are Conservative; in other counties, it is true, the majority in the municipal council may be Liberal. Three or four years ago the majority of the county councils of my province were Conservative. In the constituency which I represent, the majority of the municipal council are Conservative. In the counties of Guysborough and Antigonisih the majorities are Conservative and the lists are made up by officers appointed by these people. I have had more or less to do necessarily during the last twenty years in connection with the revision of lists, and I do give it to the House as my opinion and my judgment that our franchise system is

satisfactory to everybody in our province. I do not say you will not find complaints. No franchise system is capable of construction which would be satisfactory to every person. Naturally, some person of doubtful qualification or without qualification seeks enfranchisement and is refused. He complains and is dissatisfied, as probably would be the candidate seeking the enrolment of that particular name. That, however, does not prove that the franchise system is wrong, or that it is in any respect open to objection.

With respect to appeals to the sheriff, the number of appeals in Nova Scotia in any one year is altogether a negligible quantity. I do not pretend to speak accurately, but I venture to say that in many years, particularly in years when an election is not likely to take place, there are practically no appeals. In my constituency, where there is an electoral list of over 20,000, only 25 appeals were asserted by my political friends at the revision last March, fifteen of which were allowed and ten refused. I think that 25 is as large a number of appeals as is usually asserted in any year in my constituency. In the county of Annapolis this year 28 appeals were made on both sides; probably 6,000 or 7,000 voters are enrolled in that constituency. Eleven men were struck off, seven were added, and ten were left on; that was the disposal of the 28 appeals. In the counties of Guysborough, Antigonish and Cape Breton—in the latter county the electoral list contains about 20,000 names—not an appeal was asserted last year.

Mr. DAVIDSON: Would my hon. friend like to know why appeals were not made?

Mr. A. K. MACLEAN: I do not know; I suppose it was because there were none to make. I should trust my hon. friend to make every appeal that he thought was possible.

Mr. DAVIDSON: The reason is that it has been found by experience that to appeal is absolutely useless.

Mr. A. K. MACLEAN: Has my hon. friend any objection to the sheriff of Annapolis county as an appellate tribunal in this matter?

Mr. DAVIDSON: The objection I have to the sheriff in Annapolis county is that he feels constrained to take the advice of the Attorney General, who represents the county in the provincial House. That advice is very bad, and, at times, very vicious.

Mr. A. K. MACLEAN: When was the present sheriff of Annapolis county appointed?

Mr. DAVIDSON: Two years ago.

Mr. A. K. MACLEAN: The last revision was the first under which he acted as an appeal officer?

Mr. DAVIDSON: No.

Mr. A. K. MACLEAN: I think it was the first.

Mr. DAVIDSON: It was not the first.

Mr. A. K. MACLEAN: Does my hon. friend mean to say that the present sheriff of Annapolis county, sitting as an appeal officer under our franchise Act, would deal unjustly with the appeals?

Mr. DAVIDSON: My hon. friend is aware that in 1911, when he was Attorney General of Nova Scotia, after the lists had left the revisers, the sheriff and the clerk, absolutely contrary to law, altered the list so as to make a great change in the county of Annapolis. Appeal was made to my hon. friend as Attorney General, and he instructed the sheriff by wire to remedy, in some particular instances, the grievances which he had caused. After receiving the wire the sheriff went to the Liberal member for the county, who is now Attorney General of the province. The Liberal member told him to disregard the Attorney General's wire ,and the lists stood as they were cooked.

Mr. A. K. MACLEAN: Evidently as Attorney General I carried out the request made to me by the member for Annapolis. If he had come back to me and had shown that the sheriff of Annapolis county had disregarded my instructions, I should have punished the sheriff. However, that sheriff is dead.

Mr. DAVIDSON: My hon. friend is not quite right. While my hon. friend was Attorney General I made complaint that a certain justice of the peace, a gentleman by the name of I. B. Whitman, who was an officer of the provincial Government, had forged applications for the adding of names to the list. My hon. friend merely appointed a commissioner who went down and whitewashed him.

Mr. A. K. MACLEAN: I forget the circumstances respecting this particular justice of the peace, and I shall not take up the time of the House in discussing the matter. I venture the opinion that I did what I should have done. But my hon.

friend is talking about a sheriff who is dead; I am talking about the present sheriff. I have asked my hon. friend if he has any objection to that sheriff, and he has not answered my question.

Mr. DAVIDSON: My hon. friend appeals for information; I am bound to give it if it is in my power to do so. The sheriff of the county of Annapolis tries to do his duty, but he has informed me that he is obliged to take the advice of the Attorney General of Nova Scotia, who is the member for Annapolis in the provincial legislature. The advice that the Attorney General gives is always in favour of the Liberals and against the Conservatives. I may add that the present sheriff was appointed by the Attorney General of the province; he naturally feels under obligation to take the advice of the gentleman who appointed him.

Mr. A. K. MACLEAN: I direct the attention of the Secretary of State to the fact that we have my hon. friend's recommendation of the sheriff of Annapolis county as revising officer. As I pointed out, last March only 28 appeals were asserted in the county, to an officer who, as the member for Annapolis says, endeavours to do justice. A few moments ago he said that the reason why more appeals were not asserted was because he had not faith in the sheriff as revising officer. Now he admits that this officer is a just man, and anxious to deal fairly in these matters. I assume, therefore, that the reason why not more than 28 appeals were asserted in the county was that no more could have been made; that there was no necessity of making any more.

I register my protest against this amendment. It will entail an enormous amount of work upon the candidates at the next election. It is an unnecessary provision, because only a few months ago, a revision of the lists in Nova Scotia was completed. No one, either Conservative or Liberal, complained about that revision. The list was made up by municipal officers, as has been customary; and not many complaints have been made concerning the work done by these municipal officers as revisers. Consequently, few appeals are ever made to the sheriffs. I know that it is useless to protest this afternoon against this legislation. I am surprised at some members of the Government who sit here and consent to the passage of the amendment. I am surprised to see the Minister of Trade and Commerce (Sir George Foster) who strives for high ideals in public affairs—

or pretends to—sitting idly by and assenting to an amendment to this legislation which seeks to establish a Dominion Franchise Act for one province alone. I object to the motives which prompt the introduction of this amendment.

Mr. DAVIDSON: Will my hon. friend pardon me for a moment?

Mr. A. K. MACLEAN: The hon. gentleman will have an opportunity of speaking in a moment. As I have said, I realize how useless it is for one to protest this afternoon against this legislation. But I do want to register my protest against it. There will come a time when we shall have an opportunity of appealing to the sovereign power in the country, the people. We shall appeal to the people of my province against this iniquitous legislation. I feel sure that they will not approve the miserable, partisan course pursued by some members of the House in seeking at this stage to introduce an amendment into what is already a very cumbersome piece of legislation, the War-Time Elections Act—an action taken purely for base political and partisan purposes. We will take our appeal, Mr. Speaker, from this House to Philippi, and we will meet hon. gentlemen there on this issue.

Hon. ARTHUR MEIGHEN (Secretary of State): The House will note that, while the hon. junior member for Halifax (Mr. A. K. Maclean) used the worst language and adjectives in his vocabulary in describing this amendment of the Senate, he did not, in the course of an address lasting three-quarters of an hour, give to the House the least indication of what the amendment was. No word of his will afford the least illumination to any hon. member of the House as to the nature of the amendment or what change it made. He gave the impression that, in some way, Nova Scotia was singled out and some peculiar method of list preparation applied to that province at the dictation of the Government in the Senate, which peculiar method was embodied in the amendment now before this House. which the hon. member discussed this afternoon, is an amendment prepared by his own side of the House and adopted by ourselves. I know, while that is the truth, it is not the whole truth, and I purpose giving the whole truth. The Bill introduced by the Government into this House provided, speaking broadly, two methods of list preparation. The one method applied to the four western provinces and Prince Edward Island and that method was, in the

main, the method heretofore obtaining in Alberta and Saskatchewan for twelve years gone by. The other method applied to the other four provinces of Canada, of which Nova Scotia was one. Why was the division made?

Mr. A. K. MACLEAN: Why did you change your mind?

Mr. MEIGHEN: I will get to that very soon. My mind is just where it always has been. I would like, in the first place, to get some of the facts before Parliament because the hon. gentleman was very short on facts and strong on adjectives. The four provinces of Ontario, Quebec, New Brunswick and Nova Scotia had lists that were in force and that could be utilized. There is no question about that. Ontario, with the exception of the cities, had a list that could be utilized, although it was not altogether a desirable list, because, in some parts, that list is not as new as it should be. Consequently, in those four provinces it was proposed, in the original Bill, that those lists, so far as they went, should be used, and that the power of the enumerators should extend only to adding the names of women voters to the list and striking out the names of alien enemy voters and conscientious objectors. In the other five provinces the lists could not be used, for the reason that all the women were included in the lists. As four of those provinces were of the same nature and geographical character as Saskatchewan and Alberta, there was no reason at all to apprehend that the method which had heretofore been adopted and carried out in Saskatchewan and Alberta would not work out in the other three provinces as well. We set out to adopt, so far as they could be adopted, the lists in the four provinces of Ontario, Quebec, New Brunswick and Nova Scotia. In that form the Bill went through this House. After the Government brought down its measure and after the measure was explained to Parliament, hon. members from Nova Scotia took the ground that Nova Scotia should not be included in the same category as Ontario, Quebec and New Brunswick, for this reason: whereas in Ontario they had a judicial revision of the lists under which all parties got fair treatment, which is always presumed to flow from the judges of this country, and whereas the same thing exactly obtained in Quebec, on the contrary, in the provinces of New Brunswick and Saskatchewan that did not obtain, and there was no judicial revision whatever. In the discussion of the measure as it proceeded then, because my hon. friends on this side did not have an opportunity of advancing their amendment or proposal in this House before the Bill passed——

Mr. A. K. MACLEAN: Why?

Mr. MEIGHEN: Because hon. gentlemen opposite took up all the time.

Some hon. MEMBERS: Oh, oh.

Mr. MEIGHEN: And because furthermore, we were driven close to the end of this session and dangerously close to the seventh day of October in order to enable us to get this legislation through the Senate.

Mr. A. K. MACLEAN: Does the Solicitor General (Mr. Meighen) not remember that, on the third reading, my hon. friend from Carleton (Mr. Carvell) waited for an hour and a half for the conclusion of the debate in order to have an opportunity of moving another amendment?

Mr. MEIGHEN: That is quite true.

Mr. A. K. MACLEAN: The members on the other side of the House were blocking the debate.

Mr. MEIGHEN: An hour and a half was taken up by hon. gentlemen on this side before the conclusion of the debate on the third reading. But if my hon. friend's amendment had been agreed to, what would that have meant? We should have had to move to go back into committee on the Bill, and when we got back into committee, several days would have elapsed before the Bill could be sent to the Senate. To come to the point, while New Brunswick and Nova Scotia had no judicial revision New Brunswick, as the matter came out in the discussion, was in a different position from Nova Scotia, because in New Brunswick the lists were made up by municipal officers and there was no revision of those lists and no final say on those lists on the part of any single officer of any party. Those lists were made up by officials who were not the officials of any single party in this House.

Mr. CARVELL: Will the Solicitor General permit me to correct him? Because he is in error, and I know he would not want to be in error. In New Brunswick the final say as to the lists on which we shall have to vote, rests in the hands of a prominent Conservative in every case appointed by the Lieutenant Governor in

Council, and no list was effective unless it was signed by that man as the chairman of the board.

Mr. MEIGHEN: The lists were made up by one official appointed by the provincial government and two officials who are members of the county council. There has to be a majority of those three men.

Mr. CARVELL: That is where the minister is wrong. No list is of any value unless it is signed by the political chairman appointed by the Government.

Mr. MEIGHEN: My hon. friend knows that any list signed by the chairman is of no value unless it has the approval of at least one of the other two men.

Mr. CARVELL: Unless it is signed by the chairman it is of no value. There is another provision, that the list might be made up by the secretary-treasurer.

Mr. MEIGHEN: If the list is approved by the other two, the chairman must sign it.

Mr. CARVELL: That is just what he does not do.

Mr. MEIGHEN: Could he not be made to do so by mandamus?

Mr. CARVELL: There is a special provision in the law that a list is of no effect unless it is signed by the chairman of the board, and that is the end of the matter.

Mr. MEIGHEN: If the majority of the board says: That is the list, cannot the chairman be compelled to sign it?

Mr. CARVELL: No. There is another provision made—

Mr. MEIGHEN: I know what my hon. friend is driving at. It is not the list until it is signed.

Mr. CARVELL: There is another official altogether. The secretary-treasurer of the county makes up a list after that.

Mr. MEIGHEN: The acts of those men are official acts, and they must sign them, if the majority of the board say so.

Mr. CARVELL: That is not so.

Mr. MEIGHEN: Then the whole law of New Brunswick must be farcical.

Mr. CARVELL: It is farcical.

Mr. MEIGHEN: My hon. friend the other day said the lists were all right.

Mr. CARVELL: I would rather take those partisan lists than the lists your enumerators will make over for us.

[Mr. Carvell.]

Mr. MEIGHEN: My hon. friend is cornered now. It would be a farcical procedure to appoint two members of a board and say to them: Your work does not count, the list is only the list when it is signed by the chairman.

Mr. CARVELL: That is the fact anyway.

Mr. MEIGHEN: I undertake to say it is not the fact, because that would be a spurious law for any province to make.

Mr. A. K. MACLEAN: On what date did the Government decide to accede to the request made by the members for Nova Scotia on this side of the House, and secure this amendment?

Mr. MEIGHEN: There was no formal decision of the Government at all until today, when we are faced with this amendment from the Senate.

Mr. A. K. MACLEAN: The hon. member told the House a moment ago that the reason this amendment was not introduced on the second reading or in the committee was that the Government did not get a chance because we on this side of the House occupied all the time.

Mr. MEIGHEN: That is the reason the hon. gentleman who intended to propose it did not get it in. They might have done so at the very last moment, but there was no time at all in which to give it fair discussion. Now we are coming to the serious point of this debate, the point to which my hon. friend from Halifax does not want us to come. In the province of Nova Scotia, distinguished from every province of Canada, they have a system of making up the lists which, considered in itself—that is so far as the making up only of the lists is concerned—is fair enough, I presume. In that province the lists are made up by county council officials, at all events not appointees of the provincial government or of this Government. But the lists are revised on appeal before an appointee of the provincial government, a partisan official.

Mr. A. K. MACLEAN: That is wrong. The sheriff does not revise the lists; he is not called a reviser. The revisers under our statute are the municipal officers appointed to do that work. The sheriff simply hears the appeals; that and nothing more.

Mr. MEIGHEN: I do not care what you call it; he has the right to strike any name off the list.

Mr. A. K. MACLEAN: Only on appeal.

Mr. MEIGHEN: He has the final say as to whose name shall be struck off and whose name shall remain on. What would hon. gentlemen say if we proposed to this House a Bill that gave an official of this Government the final say as to whether any man should go on the list, or any man be struck off? That does not obtain under this Bill in any province, nor anything like it. But that was the condition of affairs in Nova Scotia. The official who had the final say was an official appointed by the provincial government, and at the mercy from day to day of the provincial government. That was the complaint urged against this measure on behalf of members who knew conditions in Nova Scotia, and that was the complaint urged in the Senate by members representing the province of Nova Scotia in that House. As a consequence, an amendment was introduced in the Senate, but it was not at all to the effect of the amendment that is now brought down into this House. The amendment proposed in the Senate did not single out Nova Scotia in any way whatever. It simply put the province of Nova Scotia in the same category as the four western provinces of Canada and the province of Prince Edward Island.

Mr. DAVIDSON: The amendment, as introduced in the Senate, included New Brunswick as well, but at the request of the hon. member for Carleton (Mr. Carvell) and other Liberal members from Nova Scotia, New Brunswick was dropped from the amendment.

Mr. CARVELL: I never asked the Senate or anybody else to drop New Brunswick from the amendment. I knew nothing about it, except that I was prepared to fight it to the bitter end, if it came here.

Mr. MEIGHEN: It was originally introduced in that form, and finally, at the request of members on the other side of the House in the Senate, New Brunswick was dropped. I do not know whether the hon. member for Carleton had anything to do with it or not. The amendment, however, as introduced in the Senate, did not single out Nova Scotia. It simply put the province of Nova Scotia in exactly the same position as the four western provinces of Canada and Prince Edward Island; it did that, and nothing more, and nothing less. In a word, it put the province of Nova Scotia in exactly the same position that the provinces of Alberta and Saskatchewan have been in ever since they were provinces, ever since hon. gentlemen opposite created those provinces and created the machinery in those provinces under which elections are held. That was the great crime we were committing, and it was against that sin that hon. gentlemen opposite rose in protest, and proposed their method of making the lists. They would not tolerate that in the province of Nova Scotia the same principles of making the lists should obtain which they had themselves imposed twelve years before in regard to the provinces of Alberta and Saskatchewan. That is all that we propose, and not even that. We proposed safeguards in Alberta and Saskatchewan which never obtained before, and which, though hon. gentlemen complain of them, they did not want to have removed at all. We had to do without those safeguards twelve years ago. Hon. gentlemen opposite were not satisfied to have Nova Scotia put in the same category as the four western provinces and Prince Edward Island, and they rose in protest. At the conference threats were made. They would not stand for Nova Scotia being put in the same class with the four western provinces, even under the safeguards then existing, and unless Nova Scotia was put back where it was, and the final say rested with the sheriff as of yore instead of there being the judicial revision that obtained in the four western provinces, they threatened to do so and so. However, a proposal was made by way of amendment to the amendment in the Senate, along the lines of the amendment which is now embodied in the Votes and Proceedings, and comes down to this House, which in principle was the same as the amendment to the amendment, but worked out so as to make it fit in with the rest of the Act as to time. It did not differ in principle, however, in any way whatever. Hon. gentlemen opposite, in association with their friends in the Senate, would rather have had the Bill just as it went to the Senate.

Mr. A. K. MACLEAN: We would have had none at all if we could have helped it.

Mr. MEIGHEN: They would have had no women voters and would have struck off no conscientious objectors, and no aliens. It is the alien vote they have been so solicitious about for many months now in this House. I know that. But rather than be put in the same class with the four western provinces they proposed the machinery that is now embodied in the amendment which comes from the Senate to the Commons. That is the origin of this amendment.

Mr. A. K. MACLEAN: I deny that statement. The amendment now before the House originated with hon. gentlemen opposite. It is true there was a compromise by which we were represented at the conference endeavouring to make the Bill as unobjectionable as possible.

Mr. MEIGHEN: That is not the point. Does not the hon. gentleman admit that the amendment to the amendment in the Senate was moved by an hon. gentleman on the Opposition side of the Senate? That is what is now embodied here.

Mr. A. K. MACLEAN: There were many conferences at which both sides were represented, so that it cannot be truthfully said that the amendment was the work of any one person, or of any one party. I am surprised that my hon. friend refers to this at all.

Mr. MEIGHEN: The hon. gentleman referred to it.

Mr. A. K. MACLEAN: I referred to it, yes.

Mr. MEIGHEN: I do not know what took place prior to the proposal of the amendment to the amendment. If there were conferences prior to that, I know nothing about them. But after the proposal of the amendment to the amendment there were many conferences, and that amendment to the amendment finally resulted in what is now before the House of Commons of Canada brought down from the Senate.

Mr. A. K. MACLEAN: I do not object to the statement put in that way.

Mr. MEIGHEN: That is the origin of the legislation, be it good or be it bad. What is this legislation? What is it that all this disputing is about, and to which objection is taken? This legislation, described shortly, has this effect. It places the province of Nova Scotia in a position very similar, though not altogether the same, as the cities in the province of Ontario—very similar, let me repeat, to the cities in the province of Ontario. It provides that the list that are now in force there, shall be the basis of the lists that shall be made by the enumerators as the lists of that province. But those lists, so made up by the enumerators, go before the courts of that province—and I shall define the courts in a moment—for revision prior to the election.

Judicial revision in that province prior to the election is the principle of the amendment to which hon. gentlemen object. Does it sound very strong logic in the mouth of the hon. member for Halifax to say: "I protest against the system embodied in this amendment, which means judicial revision of the lists—or, as he calls it, a judicial appeal of the lists—prior to the elections, and instead of that I want appeal of the lists to stand as they are now, resting in the sheriffs alone"? What this amendment provides is in reality the substituting of the county court judiciary of the province of Nova Scotia for the sheriffs of Nova Scotia. That is what my hon. friend protests against. The women are added, and the aliens and others are struck off who are shown to have had no right to go on at the time the lists were made, any others are added who have the right to go on. The lists then come before the judges of Nova Scotia and are revised by them prior to election day. This was not made more general in this Act, because it was felt that in some rural parts of the country in particular, and in very many parts of the country not altogether rural, judicial revision was in its purest form an absolute impossibility if we were to have the election in any reasonable time. Therefore the method was confined to the province of Nova Scotia. It was suggested that to get over the difficulty the judges should do the work so far as they could, but that they should have the privilege of naming barristers of a certain number of years' standing to conduct the revisions in other parts where they could not act, so that while the judges do not do it all themselves it is done by others named by the judges and in no way named by or appertaining to the party in power. That is the system of judicial revision which will obtain under this amendment in the province of Nova Scotia, and that is the system which we submit to the House as preferable to the system of sheriff revision which has obtained in days gone by. It is true, it was proposed to adopt lists that could be adopted at all, in so far as those lists were completed, and on that principle I submitted the Bill to the House including the Nova Scotia lists as adopted. When those matters were represented to us as they were, that Nova Scotia was not in the same position even as New Brunswick and in a much different position from the provinces of Ontario and Quebec where there was full and complete judicial revision, it was not deemed unfair that that province should be given the advantage of judicial revision in place of sheriff revision. That is the purpose of this amend-

ment and it has no other purpose. While hon. gentlemen opposite have a perfect right to object to the amendment, still I think the public of this country will come to the conclusion that an improvement has been made in the Act, and that there is no very great sincerity on the part of hon. members in arguing against a judicial revision in place of a sheriff revision in the province of Nova Scotia.

Mr. J. H. SINCLAIR (Guysborough): Before this measure is finally dealt with I wish to be allowed to enter my protest. I regard this move as a piece of partisan injustice, and I think it will be so regarded by every fair-minded man in the province of Nova Scotia. It is resorted to absolutely without any excuse. The Secretary of State has drawn attention to the fact that under this proposal he has substituted a judicial revision by the county court judges for the revision formerly carried on by the sheriffs, but he does not deal with the question that he is substituting partisan officers to make the lists in the first place, instead of the revisers appointed by the county council. We have in the province of Nova Scotia, as you know, Mr. Speaker, a system which has existed for the last thirty-eight years, and has given complete satisfaction to the people of the province.

Some hon. MEMBERS: No, no.

Mr. SINCLAIR: It has been the boast of the Conservative party of the province of Nova Scotia that they originated the Municipal Council Act.

Mr. DAVIDSON: Who introduced politics into the municipal councils?

Mr. SINCLAIR: This principle is found in the original Act, which was passed by the Holmes-Thompson Government in 1879, and which gave to the province of Nova Scotia municipal government for the first time.

Mr. McCURDY: If the system about which the hon. gentleman speaks has been so satisfactory in the province of Nova Scotia for all these years, will he tell the House why it was that the Attorney General of that province, who is the present junior member for Halifax (Mr. A. K. Maclean) introduced an amending Act in the Nova Scotia Legislature in 1909, providing that there should be judicial review in that province, and why, after introducing that Act, and giving it the first reading, he did not go any further with it?

Mr. A. K. MACLEAN: It is very easy for my hon. friend (Mr. McCurdy) to ask the hon. member from Guysborough (Mr. Sinclair) that question, because he knows my hon. friend from Guysborough cannot answer it. I do not recall all the provisions of the Bill I introduced in the legislature of Nova Scotia, but the main idea was to introduce manhood suffrage. Our qualification is exceedingly low now, and I endeavoured to establish the principle of manhood suffrage and registration.

Mr. SINCLAIR: I quite understand there are people in Nova Scotia who advocate a judicial revision, and I am not putting myself against the proposal, but I will make the statement that there has not been any injustice done in the province of Nova Scotia so far as the sheriffs are concerned. The responsible party is not the sheriff, but the municipal council. Each county is divided up into polling districts, a group of polling districts is called a revisal district, and the municipal councillor practically appoints the reviser for his polling division. He stands up in the presence of his colleagues in the council and proposes his man as reviser for that district. If he proposes a man who is not regarded as straight and honest, his proposal will not be accepted. The practice has been so satisfactory in Nova Scotia that it is a rare thing to have an appeal. Since this proposed change was suggested, I telegraphed to my county. I received an answer yesterday from the municipal district of St. Mary's to the effect that there had not been an appeal for many years against the lists made by the revising officers. I telegraphed to the other municipality, Guysborough, and I am informed that the year before last there were no appeals; last year there were twelve. In the county of Antigonish, which is not part of the constituency yet, but which I hope to represent, there were no appeals last year or the year before. No one will say the reason why there were no appeals was that they did not expect to get justice from the sheriffs. The reason was because every one was perfectly satisfied with the lists made by the revisers. The Prime Minister of Nova Scotia, Hon. George H. Murray, is well known throughout Canada as a candid and truthful man. It appears he has heard of this measure going through the House. I have a message sent by him to an hon. member of this House, in which he says:

> I have a general knowledge of the revision of the provincial lists in the province of Nova Scotia for a period of twenty-five years, and I have no knowledge of any objection from either of the political parties to the fairness of the decisions of the sheriffs as court of appeal. I have consulted other officials of the Government, and they are all of opinion that our

sheriffs have always acted independently and without political prejudice. Our sheriffs hold office during good behaviour. I would regard a return to the preparation of lists by partisan temporary officials on the eve of a pending election as likely to develop a great amount of bitter feeling. You must understand that our provincial system provides for every measure of publicity by the posting of lists in public places, and ample opportunity is given both parties for every reasonable objection.

That, Sir, is the statement of the Premier of Nova Scotia who is known by every hon. member on both sides of this House to be an honourable and fair man and one who knows what he is talking about. The municipal councils are the responsible bodies and we propose to pass an Act which will cast a reflection not only upon the sheriffs but upon every municipal council in Nova Scotia. The conduct of the sheriffs has been been criticised by hon. gentlemen who have spoken but the Prime Minister himself has given a certificate of character to the late sheriff of Halifax, Mr. Donald Archibald. He said that he regarded him as a fair man. He was for many years sheriff of that county. He also stated the other day that the present sheriff of Halifax was regarded as a fair man so there has been no complaint in Halifax. I can say the same thing for the sheriff of Pictou There is no man who knows him who would venture to say that he would be guilty of any unfairness in regard to the revision of the lists. The same can be said of the sheriffs of Antigonish, Guysborough and Colchester. These are the sheriffs whom I know best. The statement that this amendment becomes necessary in order to avoid injustice on the part of the sheriffs of Nova Scotia is not well founded and cannot be supported by evidence.

Why does the Secretary of State depart from the policy that he laid down when this Bill was introduced? We all understood that the policy of the Government with regard to the four provinces of Nova Scotia, New Brunswick, Ontario and Quebec was that the existing lists were to hold and that no changes were to be made except those that were necessary to add the names of female relatives of soldiers and to strike off the names of aliens. That was the policy laid down by the Secretary of State for those four provinces. What justification can there be for singling out the province of Nova Scotia and adopting a different system. The only possible explanation is that it was done for the sake of obtaining a partisan advantage for the Conservative side. This is what the Secretary of State said when introducing the Bill:

[Mr. Sinclair.]

The lists so made up of male voters all judicially revised in Ontario and Quebec and revised by the provincial methods in Nova Scotia and New Brunswick, are by this Bill adopted, so far as they go. The only requirement as to them is to add such of the women as by this Bill are to be entitled to vote and to substract such of the men, if any, as, by reason of alienage, should not be entitled to vote.

Then he goes on to say:

As regards these latter the lists are adopted and the enumeration only goes to the adding of the names of the additional women now entitled to vote and to the striking off of those who by reason of alienage, and nothing else, are disentitled to vote. That is the province and duty of the registrars or enumerators, whatever you call them, and that alone.

Why was not that principle followed out in Nova Scotia? It was simply for the reason that the Nova Scotia members of the Conservative side asked that this change be made in order to load the dice and gain a partisan advantage. That is the only reason that can be given. Under the provincial law of Nova Scotia practically every man who is entitled to a vote becomes an elector. The requirements are very low. The ownership of $150 worth of real estate entitles a man to vote. If he earns $250 he is entitled to be placed on the register as an income voter. If he owns a farm worth $600 he can qualify himself and four sons. Practically every man in Nova Scotia who desires a vote has it under the existing system. The county councils are primarily responsible and they discharge the duty well.

The Government propose by this amendment to adopt a system which is altogether different. The enumerators are appointed by themselves and are practically certain to be partisans. They will all be of one stripe. You cannot have that in the county councils. County councils and revisers appointed by them are bound to be composed of men of both political parties, sometimes Conservative and sometimes Liberal. In the county which I have the honour to represent the county council happens for the last term to be Conservatives, but I have no reason to complain in regard to their action in apointing revisers for making lists. Under this proposal the partisan enumerator does not even require to be a resident of the district. A stranger who never saw the district, and who is not known to a single inhabitant in the district may be sent in to act as enumerator.

If permitted I would like to make an appeal to the Prime Minister. The Prime Minister is going to ask the people of Can-

ada for re-election in a few weeks. He will issue a manifesto. In that manifesto there will be a paragraph stating that he has made every effort to obtain a Union Government. He will ask the Canadian people to cast aside all partisanship and to unite with him in helping to push forward the great enterprise that we all have so much at heart. That will no doubt be a part of his appeal to the people. But the people will ask him a question and that question will be: "Did you forget partisanship yourself?" Let me say this, Mr. Speaker: the very last act of his Administration will be regarded by every liberal and fair-minded man in Nova Scotia as a piece of extreme partisanship and it will not read very well side by side with the manifesto which my right hon. friend will issue. If I had a right to make a proposal to him it would be this: Refuse to agree to this amendment of the Senate and leave the lists in Nova Scotia alone, except to add the names of the female relatives of soldiers and to strike out the names of aliens. Say to the Senate that it is no part of their duty to interfere with the lists for election of members of the House of Commons. Let the Prime Minister say to the hon. members for Annapolis (Mr. Davidson) the hon. member for Queens aud Shelburne (Mr. McCurdy) the hon. gentleman in the other chamber from Pictou Mr. John C. Douglas of Cape Breton, and all the other gentlemen who are pressing the Government in this matter that they must go back to their counties and win their elections in fair fight on the lists that are in existence now and as they have been fairly made by the municipal councils in Nova Scotia. I suppose my right hon. friend will not take my advice but it is my duty to offer it to him and it is my duty to protest with all the energy I have against this attempt to bedevil the electoral lists of my province and thereby gain a partisan advantage for the Conservative party in Nova Scotia.

Mr. G. W. KYTE (Richmond): Mr. Speaker, the Electoral Franchise Act of Nova Scotia was based upon the Municipal Incorporations Act passed in 1879 under the auspices of the only Conservative Government that ever existed in Nova Scotia since Confederation. The Holmes-Thompson Government, in the first session after its accession to office, passed the Municipal Incorporation Act which established the county councils and made provision for the appointment of revisers to prepare the voters' lists at each annual meeting of these municipal councils. These revisers are appointed according to the political complexion of the councillor representing each polling district. Every municipal council is made up of councillors of both political parties and it is a fact that no matter what may be the political complexion of the majority of the councillors a Conservative councillor always has the right to nominate his own reviser.

Mr. DAVIDSON: That is absolutely incorrect. In the county council in Annapolis, where the Liberals have a majority the Liberals appoint all the revisers and the Conservatives appoint none.

Mr. KYTE: I suppose there is no man in public life who has more information that is not true than the hon. member for Annapolis (Mr. Davidson). I repeat that the revisers are appointed upon the nomination of Conservative councillors irrespective of whether the majority of the councillors is Liberal or Conservative.

That being the case, there is always a large number of Conservative revisers appointed in Nova Scotia. In the municipality of the county which I represent, there is a majority of Conservative councillors, and the majority of revisers in that county is also Conservative. In the town in which I live, the three revisers are Conservatives. They held a revision of the electoral list on the fifth of March last, and after they had heard applications involving the adding to or striking off from the list of 25 or 30 names, only one appeal was taken to the sheriff of the county. In the municipality of the county of Cape Breton, where there are some 20,000 votes, the revisers held their court on the 5th of March last, and although they considered hundreds and perhaps thousands of applications to be added to or rejected from the voters' lists, not a single appeal was taken to the sheriff of the county of Cape Breton. I do not think that even the hon. member for Annapolis (Mr. Davidson) will undertake to say that the people of Cape Breton, whether Liberal or Conservative, have not confidence in Mr. George B. Ingraham, sheriff of the county. It is no answer to the statement I make that no appeals were taken to the sheriff last year to say that the people had not confidence in Sheriff Ingraham.

Mr. DAVIDSON: Who would be better able to say that than Judge—

Mr. KYTE: If any person were rash enough to make that statement it would be indignantly denied by every one in

Nova Scotia who knows Sheriff Ingraham. But so fair was the revision, so eminently satisfactory was the work performed by the revisers in the various municipal districts, as well as by the registrar of voters in Sydney and Glace Bay, that every person was perfectly satisfied with the revision of the lists. The same thing is true of every county in eastern Nova Scotia. I cannot undertake to say what are the conditions in western Nova Scotia, but the only criticism that has been directed against the appeals carried to sheriffs in Nova Scotia was the one case referred to by the hon. member for Annapolis. I do not know what conditions exist in Annapolis, but, judging from the choice of the electors of that county as witnessed by the present representative, I should say the electorate of that county does strange things on occasions. The point made by the Secretary of State (Mr. Meighen) that this amendment had to be added in the Senate because there was no opportunity of doing so here, cannot prevail with members of this House, who know the circumstances so well. The hon. member for Halifax (Mr. A. K. Maclean) read from the speech made by the Secretary of State when introducing this Bill in which he said it was proposed to adhere to the lists in the provinces of Nova Scotia, New Brunswick, Ontario and Quebec. If, when this Bill was going through the House of Commons, it was intended by the Secretary of State or by the Prime Minister to make the changes that were afterwards made by the other body of this Parliament, surely the Secretary of State would not have committed himself to the principle that the lists in the province of Nova Scotia would prevail. The fact that the Secretary of State made that statement to the House of Commons is proof positive that no such change in the basis of the electoral lists in the province of Nova Scotia was in contemplation. The fact of the matter is that when this Bill got over to the Senate there was unusual activity on the part of certain hon. gentlemen representing constituencies in Nova Scotia who support this Government. Not only were they exercised as to the form and shape in which this franchise Bill should go back to the electors of Nova Scotia, and not only were they exercised themselves, but the assistance of certain other gentlemen who do not at the present time hold seats in this House was called upon. There was present in their conferences a gentleman prominent in public affairs in Cape Breton for some years, who has exercised a most baleful influence upon the public life of eastern Nova Scotia. That gentleman was in consultation with members supporting the Government in this House from day to day, and as a result of their combined wisdom, they came to the conclusion that the only chance they had of carrying the province of Nova Scotia was by loading the dice and imposing a franchise on the people of Nova Scotia that would give them an undue advantage. There is no gainsaying that. There is no other argument that can be urged which will meet the case. The result of the amendment that is being proposed by the other body of this Parliament is to deprive the workingmen of the large centres in the county of Cape Breton of their franchise. We have, as is well known, a large population engaged in industrial occupations in that constituency. In addition to the 6,000 men employed in the steel works at Sydney and Sydney Mines, there are 7,000 or 8,000 employees in the collieries of the Dominion Coal Company and the Nova Scotia Coal Company. These men exercise a large influence in public affairs in eastern Nova Scotia at the present time. The result of the voting upon the issues which will be submitted to these people in the present election is viewed with a good deal of apprehension by hon. gentlemen opposite and is greatly feared by the gentlemen who will be the candidates of the Government in the ensuing election. It is pretty well known that the labouring men throughout the country are opposed to this Government. They are opposed to this Government, not only on the subject of conscription but because the Government has failed, when conscripting men, to conscript the wealth of this country as well. The workingmen of Cape Breton are opposed to this Government because the Government has failed to grapple with the great question of the cost of living. The working people of Canada realize that, while sacrifices are being demanded of men who are asked to recruit for overseas service and to give up their lives in the cause of the Allies and in defence of the principles of liberty, the sacrifice has been limited almost entirely to the men who enlist for overseas service, and that instead of sacrifices being made by men engaged in industrial enterprise in Canada, many of these men have taken the opportunity which the war gave them of amassing large fortunes. These are some of the reasons why the working people in Canada, and more particularly in the

5 p.m.

island of Cape Breton, are opposed to this Government .

Hon. gentlemen who desire the Government to win constituencies in Nova Scotia and who realize that the sentiment of the working people is against them in this contest determined when this Franchise Bill went over to the other House of this Parliament, that they would introduce an amendment to the franchise which would result in disfranchising a large element of the population in the industrial centres of Nova Scotia and placing upon the electoral list a large number who are not qualified and would not otherwise be placed upon it. No person will realize that better than the workingmen themselves, and none will be readier to respond to the appeals for justice and fair play which will be made to them when the election comes in the course of the next few weeks. We in Nova Scotia have been singled out for special treatment by this Government. The electoral lists of New Brunswick are to stand as the basis of the franchise to be used in the coming election. The electoral lists in Ontario and Quebec are to stand as the basis of the franchise for the coming election. But the province of Nova Scotia—and I regret to have to say it, the province represented by the right hon. the Prime Minister—has been singled out for unfair treatment in order that this Government may get an unfair advantage when it comes to the elections in that province, the result of which they fear so greatly.

I should feel that I was not discharging my full duty to the people whom I represent in the island of Cape Breton if I did not make as strenuous a protest as I am capable of making against this iniquitous legislation, which was designed solely and exclusively to steal the election for the Government in Nova Scotia.

Mr. DAVIDSON: Mr. Speaker——

Mr. SPEAKER: Order. The hon. member has no right to speak at this stage.

Mr. F. B. McCURDY (Shelburne and Queens): Mr. Speaker, my observation of discussions in this Parliament has not led me to the conclusion that condemnation by hon. members opposite of any proposed measure carries with it any assurance that that measure is without merit. The strenuous opposition of hon. gentlemen opposite to the Senate amendment of itself suggests to one's mind that there may be something wrong with the present lists.

I have talked with many members of the House from western Canada, where the system ensuring fresh lists prevails. I listened to the discussions in this House of the Wartime Elections Bill and I failed to hear any objection or any criticism of the manner in which the enumerator system operates in the western provinces. Personally I should have preferred the extension of that system to Nova Scotia. It already applies to Prince Edward Island. I should have liked to see it in operation in Nova Scotia, but as a result of conferences which took place between hon. gentlemen opposite and Liberal members of the Senate, instead of having a uniform system for Prince Edward Island, Nova Scotia and New Brunswick as was proposed originally in the Senate we are now to have a system which applies to Nova Scotia only.

I cannot follow the argument of the member for Richmond (Mr. Kyte) when he says that men will be unfairly disqualified by this amendment. He has failed to point out any unfairness in this provision or shown how it will work to the disadvantage of any portion of the electorate. Surely no hardship can result through enlarging the opportunity to correct previous errors and wrongs. Under the system which has prevailed in Nova Scotia, good Canadians have frequently been left off the list. Under normal conditions the average citizen is not much concerned about having his name added to the voters' list, and a great deal of care and attention is necessary to see that he is registered. Under the old system a person fully qualified to be registered would find his name omitted from the lists.

At this crisis, when the people are to pass upon an issue of utmost national importance every patriotic citizen should have the opportunity of voting. Every opportunity should be given for bringing the lists up to date. This is not a case where voters are endeavouring to get their names on the lists; rather it is an occasion where the greatness of the issue demands the expression of every loyal man's opinion.

Had no amendment been made to the Bill, if the name of a man was not on the provincial list last revised, he would be denied the right to vote. Every member from Nova Scotia knows of cases where people properly entitled to the vote have had their names left off the list. In some counties of Nova Scotia the lists contain thousands of names with no addresses at all; these names may or may not be fictitious.

Mr. A. K. MACLEAN: In what county?

Mr. McCURDY: In many counties.

Mr. A. K. MACLEAN: Name one

Mr. McCURDY: If my hon. friend will take the trouble to refer to the voters' lists as printed last year, he will find that in many counties this condition exists.

Only a few years ago a leading King's Counsel residing in the city of Halifax, the president of one of the largest banking institutions in Canada, had his name left off the voters' list and the first intimation he had of that was when he went to the poll to vote. He went to the poll as usual. His name was not registered under the provincial system and he was denied the right to cast his ballot on that occasion.

Mr. A. K. MACLEAN: May I tell my hon. friend that I know—

Mr. McCURDY: In any business concern that is honestly managed and where fair dealing is desired, there is never any objection to audit or revision. In Nova Scotia there has been no change in the administration of local affairs for thirty-five years. The same set of people have administered the provincial affairs of Nova Scotia during that period, and the revision of the lists as well as the conduct of other public business has been more or less running along the same groove. In a business concern, as I have said, no objection is taken by any person to a revision or a review of the work done. The very fact that my hon. friends object so vigorously to revision or audit under judicial review in the present case arouses a suspicion that there is something to hide.

One or two hon. gentlemen opposite have said that no complaint has been made in Nova Scotia in respect of the existing voters' lists. Well, that is not my experience. A few days ago I received a letter from a personal correspondent in Nova Scotia with regard to the enfranchisement of the relatives of soldiers. It was written before the particulars of the Military Voters Bill were published. I did not receive the letter until after that Bill had been introduced, and while the letter has particular reference to need of that legislation, it throws some light on the results of the existing Nova Scotia system of preparing voters' lists, and, incidentally, may also account in a measure for the strenuous opposition of the hon. members from Cape Breton. My correspondent says:

> In re proposed plan of giving votes to mothers, wives and sisters of soldiers, do not overlook the fathers. This may sound odd to you, but if you lived in a county like Victoria, you would know what voters' lists mean. I have been a county councillor for the past seven years, and I have never been allowed to appoint a reviser of voters' lists. In this district alone I know of a number of cases of men, with sons on the firing line, who have no vote.

Mr. McKENZIE: Will the hon. gentleman give the name of his authority?

Mr. McCURDY: It is my intention to support the proposed amendment, for the reason—

Mr. McKENZIE: Does my hon. friend refuse to give the name?

Mr. McCURDY: —that it is equitable, and that it will give to every person the right to vote who should have that right. It will invite a fuller and fairer expression of opinion on the part of the people of the province. It is desirable that every person who is entitled to the right of franchise should have the opportunity of giving voice to his opinion at this crisis in the country's history, and this amendment gives every person that opportunity.

Motion agreed to, and amendments concurred in.

NATIONAL SERVICE BOARD.

STATEMENT BY THE DIRECTOR GENERAL, MR. R. B. BENNETT.

Mr. R. B. BENNETT (Calgary): Perhaps, before the House arises, I might avail myself of this opportunity to state that now that the Military Service Act has come into force and various Orders in Council have been passed, dealing with matters which have received the attention of the National Service Board, this organization has ceased to exist. The various directors have tendered their resignations which have been placed in the hands of the Government. I tendered my resignation on the introduction of the Military Service Act. I came into the position under very peculiar circumstances, and it might not be amiss if I stated them shortly. In September of last year I received a telegram asking me if I would act as Director of National Service for the province in which I resided. I agreed to do so if I could be of any service to my country. I came to Ottawa in October in response to a call issued by Sir Thomas Tait, Director General of National Service, for a meeting of the district directors. I attended the meetings on the second day of the conference. On the next day, Sir Thomas Tait resigned, and it was necessary to appoint a successor. I was asked to accept the position. I did so with very great reluctance, believing, as I did, that I should not accept that responsibility, having regard to the conditions that prevailed. But if I may be permitted to use the language of Mr. Neville Chamberlain,

who accepted a somewhat similar post under somewhat similar circumstances, I was impressed by the fact, perhaps improperly, by those who urged me, that it was a patriotic duty on my part to undertake this work, and I accordingly did so. I have no regret to offer except to indicate that, at that time, the policy of the bo rd had been settled and the question as to what the general duties were had been fixed by Orders in Council. Those orders contemplated largely that the work should be carried on by district directors and not from Ottawa, but owing to difficulties that arose at the very inception of the work, it became necessary that the largest part of the work should be carried on in Ottawa. We undertook the work and endeavoured to discharge the responsibility as best we could.

At the initial meeting which was held here and to which I have referred a resolution was passed that a man-power inventory should be taken and that the signing of cards which were sent out should be compulsory, and that a penalty should be provided for their not being signed. The resolution, which was passed before Sir Thomas Tait resigned was very explicit upon that point. Those in authority, however, thought that could not be done, and, we were compelled to endeavour as best we could to create an atmosphere sufficient to induce the people voluntarily to sign the cards. In order to create that atmosphere, letters were sent to members of Parliament, senators, members of the local legislatures, labour unions, clergymen, boards of trade, fraternal organizations and practically 150,000 representative men throughout the country. Public meetings were held, advertisements were inserted in the newspapers and the first week of the year was proclaimed National Service Week. It is only fair to say that the response was much better than might reasonably have been expected, and one would hesitate to describe, except in the warmest terms, the spirit of co-operation and sympathy displayed by all those who were appealed to at this time. The result was that, by this voluntary effort, a very large number of cards were signed and returned. I ventured to point out at that time in public addresses, that this was the last great voluntary effort on the part of the Government, and the response as I have said. was everything that could be expected. The time for filling in cards was extended, but no penalty was provided and the Government did not think it advisable to make it obligatory to complete the cards. It is highly important, nay, absolutely necessary that there should be at all times created and maintained in this country a proper atmosphere in relation to this great conflict. That atmosphere can only be obtained by appealing, through concrete means to the sentiment and reason of the people. It was believed that the carrying on of a campaign of thrift, a campaign in relation to the saving of money and food and other matters of that kind would have the desired result. I urged when the enthusiasm of the people was apparent that a general campaign of this character should be organized and vigorously prosecuted. For reasons best known to those in authority the matter was not taken up at that time, but it was taken up later on. The results have to some extent justified the effort, late though it was. The enthusiasm of the people by that time had in some measure waned. When the cards came in arrangements were made to classify them, and the classification was carried on in a most comprehensive manner. I fancy perhaps very few people have an adequate appreciation of the work that was done. That part of the work was in charge of a young lady who is a graduate of Toronto University, and also of one of the largest universities in Chicago. I refer to Miss Grange, who undertook and carried on that work successfully. The cards were divided into military prospects and industrial prospects. We found 475,363 military prospects out of 1,549,360 cards, and those military prospects were subdivided into Military Classes 1-A, 1-B, 2-A, 2-B, 3-A and 3-B, having regard to the men's married or unmarried condition, the number of their dependents, age, etc. I shall hand this memorandum to Hansard without taking time to read it all. Mr. Speaker, if you will permit me, as it contains a summary of the information thus obtained.

Mr. SPEAKER: This is not according to the usual practice; but in view of the undoubted importance of the document, that might be done with the unanimous consent of the House, but only with that unanimous consent.

Some hon. MEMBERS. Carried.

Mr. R. B. BENNETT: I shall avail myself of the kind permission of the House.

(The permission of the House having been obtained, the following is printed:)

STATEMENT OF MAN-POWER INVENTORY OF CANADA TAKEN BY THE NATIONAL SERVICE BOARD, 1917.

Province.	Military Prospects.							
	Mil-1A. Ages 17-30. Unmarried. No dependents. Not engaged in essential occupations.	Mil-1B. Ages 17-30. Unmarried. No dependents. But engaged in essential occupations.	Mil-2A. Ages 31-45. Unmarried. No dependents. Not engaged in essential occupations.	Mil-2B. Ages 31-45. Unmarried. No dependents. But engaged in essential occupations.	Mil-3A. Ages 17-45. Unmarried. With dependents. Not engaged in essential occupations.	Mil-3B. Ages 17-45. Married. Not more than 3 dependents. Not engaged in essential occupations.	Mil-3C. 1 Ages 17-45. Unmarried. With dependents. But engaged in essential occupations	Mil-3C. 2 Ages 17-45. Married. Not more than 3 dependents. But engaged in essential occupations
Alberta	2,983	5,460	1,171	2,975	2,661	8,284	4,690	6,855
British Columbia	3,134	875	1,865	630	4,256	12,265	805	1,050
Manitoba	3,784	5,530	1,421	1,855	4,591	12,951	5,600	5,530
New Brunswick	3,341	1,260	479	210	2,648	4,082	910	2,660
North West Territories	6	.....	1	.....	2	7	.....	.....
Nova Scotia	5,880	2,730	963	445	5,628	6,269	4,340	1,820
Ontario	29,487	17,150	5,566	3,290	25,324	69,935	22,140	22,645
Prince Edward Island	785	1,120	129	210	571	1,125	1,505	1,225
Quebec	14,912	6,020	2,827	910	7,660	19,266	3,360	5,460
Saskatchewan	3,529	11,760	1,409	5,320	2,935	12,539	11,130	14,210
Yukon	40	25	85	1	70	110	2	4
Total	67,881	51,930	15,916	15,846	56,346	146,833	54,482	61,459

STATEMENT OF MAN-POWER INVENTORY OF CANADA TAKEN BY THE NATIONAL SERVICE BOARD, 1917—*Concluded.*

Province.	Industrial Classes.						Soldiers.	Discards.	Totals.
	Trades Answer "Yes." IND-1A.	Trades Answer "No." IND-1AA.	Not Working at Trade Answer "Yes." IND-1B.	Not Working at Trade Answer "No." IND-1BB.	Unskilled Labour Answer "Yes." IND-2.	Tool Setters, Tool Makers, Millwrights. MUN-1.			
Alberta	3,185	6,335	595	630	770	245	2,590	58,840	108,269
British Columbia	4,795	5,145	1,015	770	1,675	420	5,075	24,465	68,140
Manitoba	3,640	7,910	630	1,120	1,085	210	6,510	53,550	115,917
New Brunswick	1,750	2,590	210	215	700	245	980	26,250	48,530
North West Territories	.....	1	1	.....	1	.....	.....	6	25
Nova Scotia	3,780	7,560	315	455	350	280	5,810	47,320	93,945
Ontario	13,650	25,550	1,120	3,150	6,440	4,130	16,800	302,053	568,430
Prince Edward Island	280	875	45	105	140	12	770	8,470	17,367
Quebec	4,490	7,000	280	385	2,520	910	5,110	83,582	164,692
Saskatchewan	3,430	7,910	648	630	840	105	4,830	74,550	155,775
Yukon	595	175	35	4	70	3	21	425	1,665
Total	39,595	71,051	4,894	7,464	14,491	6,560	48,496	679,511	1,342,755

Summary of Military Prospects.

In Non-essential Occupations	286,976
Farmers	183,727
Skilled Shipbuilding, Munition and Mine Workers.	4,660
Total	475,363

General Summary.

Total number of Cards received		1,549,360
Divided as follows:—		
Visèed complete cards	1,342,755	
Incomplete cards	97,640	
Blank cards	108,965	
Total		1,549,360

Mr. R. B. BENNETT: Then it was thought it would be advisable to make an occupational survey of the country. If I had been charged with the responsibility I should have done that in the first place, and then used the information obtained by the National Service cards in conjunction with it. The occupational survey was a survey to obtain from all the employers in Canada the conditions in respect to employment now and what the conditions may be immediately after the war. That occupational survey seeks information by the aid of a very large number of questions with respect to (a) male employees, and (b) female employees. I shall avail myself of the privilege, if I may, of stating exactly what are the questions without reading them, by putting them on Hansard, and then indicate further, because I must be very hurried, that, in response to certain instructions given to us, we endeavoured to ascertain from our soldiers overseas something of what their views might be when they came back to this country with respect to agriculture.

I give, first, the form of questions for male employees; next, the form of questions for female employees.

(The permission of the House having been granted, the following is printed):

CANADA—NATIONAL SERVICE—
CONFIDENTIAL.

Please fill in each blank carefully.

Form For Male Employees.

I certify that the information contained in this schedule is complete and correct to the best of my knowledge and belief.

(Signature) .....

Date.....

Industry .....

Name of person, firm, or company supplying information .....

.....

.....

Address .....

Value of output in average normal year $.....

1. Classify in detail occupation of your male employees, including office staff.

2. Number of each class employed? (a) Before the war? (b) Now?

3. How many workers of each class could you now employ?

4. How long would such employment last?

5. Your closest estimate of number of workers required in each class within six months after end of war.

6. What classes are skilled, semi-skilled or unskilled? (Please write the proper word in each case.)

7. Present average weekly wage or earnings of workers? (Each class.)

8. Would the following physical defects interfere with employment in your establishment? (Yes or No.) (a) Loss of one leg; (b) loss of one arm; (c) loss of one eye; (d) defective hearing.

9. State number of workers temporarily laid off in normal year? (State for each class.) (a) How many? (b) In what months? (c) How many weeks in each month?

10. Number of women workers now employed in each class where men were employed before the war?

11. Do you expect to subsitute returned soldiers for present women workers after the war? If so, how many in each class?

12. How many employees in each class have enlisted since the war began?

13. Number of men workers whose places might be taken by women if necessary or desirable? Each class?

14. Would you now advance all or part of railway fares to prospective workers? (Please answer—No, All or Part.)

CANADA—NATIONAL SERVICE—
CONFIDENTIAL.

Please fill in each blank carefully.

Form For Women Employees.

I certify that the information contained in this schedule is complete and correct to the best of my knowledge and belief.

(Signature) .....

Date.....

Industry .....

Name of person, firm or company supplying information .....

.....

Address .....

Value of output in average normal year $.....

1. Classify in detail the occupations of your women employees, including office staff.

2. Number of each class employed (a) Before the war? (b) Now?

3. How many workers of each class could you now employ?

4. How long would such employment last?

5. Your closest estimate of number of workers required in each class within six months after end of war?

6. What classes are skilled, semi-skilled or unskilled? (Please write proper word in each case.)

7. Present average weekly wage or earnings of workers? (Each class.)

9. State number of workers temporarily laid off in normal year (state for each class). How many? In what months? How many weeks in each month?

14. Would you now advance all or part of railway fares to prospective workers? Please answer (No, All or Part.)

Mr. R. B. BENNETT: We circulated and have received back, up to date about 250,000 cards from those who went overseas, such cards containing 18 questions. I will file the card with Hansard if I may. That will indicate the questions asked.

(The permission of the House having been granted, the following is printed):

Important.—This information is being sought only for the benefit of Canada's soldiers after the war, and the filling in of the card imposes no obligation whatsoever. It has nothing to do with taxation or rates of any kind.

Canada

National Service, Canadian Overseas Forces.

1. Name in full.
2. Age ..... years.
3. Unit and rank.
4. Regimental number.
5. P.O. address before enlistment..... Province .....
6. How many dependents have you? State relationship, sex and age of each.
7. Which are you, married, single or widower?
8. Name and address of last employer before you enlisted?
9. What were you working at?
10. Have you a trade or profession? If so, what?
11. Is your old position open for you on your return to Canada in fit condition?
12. In what part of Canada do you propose to settle after the war?
13. Do you wish to take up farming as an occupation?
14. Have you ever worked on a farm? If so, how long?
15. How much money do you expect to have at your disposal on your return to Canada?
16. Do you desire to take advantage of any available scheme of assisted agricultural settlement?
17. If so, what province do you prefer to settle in?
18. And would you, if necessary to gain experience, work for prevailing wages on a farm after your return, provided your dependents were in the meanwhile given the same support as they now receive?

Mr. R. B. BENNETT: If the information thus obtained and still being obtained is properly collated and classified, it will assist those, who are charged with responsibility with respect to demobilization, to determine what should be done to meet a situation that, in my judgment, will be the most acute with which the country has ever been confronted. The occupational survey will indicate the probable opportunities for work throughout Canada; the overseas cards will indicate what the peculiar fitness of each returning soldier may be for the work that will offer:

With the cessation of industrial activity, the result of the shutting down of munitions factories, and with the returning to these shores of three or four hundred thousand men, it is obvious that there will be a great displacement of woman labour, and a very great demand for employment which will not be forthcoming. One might say without being tedious, that the great problem that must confront this country is the problem that will arise when this conflict is over. The absorption into our civil life of those out of employment, as well as of those who come back, is a matter of extreme importance. The taking care of the adverse balance of trade in this country, the making provision for meeting the enormous charges upon our resources, with respect to interest both on our national debt and pensions, are matters of pressing importance. There is only one way by which that can be done, and that is by the creation of new wealth, and new wealth can only be created by increased production and the development of our vast natural resources. So it is of paramount importance that the great natural resources should be developed, and we must learn what is the desire and intention of those who are left and of those who are coming back with respect to agriculture and other pursuits.

The great problem this State will have to deal with is the problem of how adequately to encourage production and development. With the burden of taxation the people will have to bear, it is only necessary to say that new capital will not come here as willingly as some people seem to think. The great problem is how to induce capital to find here an opportunity for profitable employment while at the same time arranging that adequate provision is made for the state receiving its share of the profits that may result from any enterprise that utilizes our natural resources which the state holds as trustee for all the people. I shall not dwell longer on that point. I have not time this afternoon to do more than indicate the activities that have been undertaken by the board with respect to farm labour and increased grain production during the present year, the providing of men for specific undertakings, the Royal Flying Corps, railway, shipbuilding and many other pursuits, the advertising campaign for thrift and war savings. All these things we have endeavoured to do as best we could, with what degree of success it is not for me at the present moment to discuss. In my judgment, however, the language used by Mr. Chamberlin, the Director General of National Service in England, in dealing with similar conditions might aptly apply here. He said:

> It is apparent that the rock upon which the department split was the fact that a local habitation and a loud sounding name were given to it, and that it was then launched with a roving commission to discover its functions and duties, but left without any statutory powers and no boundaries delimiting its sphere from that of other departments. My reluctance to accept such a vaguely defined post was natural, but I accepted from patriotic motives and have done my best.

I think the language of Mr. Chamberlin's valedictory might well be the language I should employ as mine, and in so doing I desire to thank the press for the very great effort they have made at all times,

under difficult circumstances to insure so far as possible the success of the movement. The thanks of this country are due to the district directors who earnestly and sincerely laboured to make their work a success and particularly to Mr. C. W. Peterson the unpaid secretary of the board to whose zeal, patience, persistence and energy in no small degree the success of the work that was undertaken is due. Nothing, however, could have left with me a more lasting or a more pleasant memory than the recollection of the sympathy which all who are in this House have extended to me in the work I was unfortunate enough to have been induced to undertake. I shall never forget the kindliness of their criticism, and their willingness to appreciate and understand the difficulties under which the work was carried on.

THE WAR-TIME ELECTIONS ACT.

Mr. D. C. ROSS (West Middlesex): There is some difference, on this side of the House at any rate, as to whether an elector who is on the voters' list of the province of Ontario, who has left the electoral district, is entitled to vote. Section 32 of the War-time Elections Act, provides that:

> The qualifications necessary to enable any male person to vote at a Dominion election in any province shall, except as by this Act otherwise provided, be those established by the laws of that province as necessary to entitle such male person to vote in the same part of the province at a provincial election.

Under the law of the province of Ontario a male person, in order to vote, has to be a resident on the day of polling domiciled in the district in which he is voting. I should like to ask the Minister of Justice (Mr. Doherty) whether that rule will still prevail under this Act.

Mr. DOHERTY (Minister of Justice): I can only give my opinion of the interpretation of the provisions of the Act, but I am very clear in that opinion. Under the first paragraph of section 32, it is made quite clear that the qualifications to vote, prescribed by the law of any province are to be the qualifications of male voters under this Act, save in so far as they may be modified by the provisions of this Act. There are but two provisions which I have heard it suggested might be said to modify what I understand to be the requirements of the Ontario law, that in order to be entitled to vote a person must be a resident in the constituency at the time he voted. The two provisions that have been suggested as possibly modifying that are subsection 2 of section 32 and section 143.

[Mr. R. B. Bennett.]

As regards subsection 2, a perusal of it will make it perfectly clear, I think, that it deals with the subject of residence only from the point of view of the operation of preparing or adding to the lists. Its purpose is merely to fix a date in relation to which the period of time required in any province for residence within the province and for residence within the constituency, shall be fixed, and it fixes the period of residence essential to entitle a man to be placed upon the list as one year within the provinces, as I understand the amendment of the Senate, and thirty days within the constituency, such periods to be fixed by reference ot the date of the writ of election. That deals only with the question of residence so far as it is to be considered in preparing or adding to lists, and its purpose and effect are merely to determine the period, and the date in relation to which that period shall be fixed.

Section 143, as I read it, is intended to, and does, simply determine, not what is the qualification to vote, but the place at which a person having all the qualifications to vote shall be entitled to vote, and the only place at which he shall be entitled to vote. The section provides:

> Except as otherwise provided in this Act, each elector shall be entitled to vote at the polling station of the polling division, or of one of the polling divisions, upon the list of voters for which his name is—

There is a misprint in the Bill, but at all events the man's name figures on the list. I would point out that the section does not create the right to vote, and I say that, because it deals only with a person who is an elector, and the definition section of the Elections Act defines an elector as a person who is entitled to vote. So that it means simply that any person entitled to vote shall be so entitled at a particular time.

Mr. CARVELL: In connection with the subject under discussion, I would like to put a concrete case before the minister in order to have his judicial opinion on it. I take it for granted from what he has stated that under the provisions of section 143 a man can only vote at the place from which his name is upon the voters' list. According to the laws of the province of New Brunswick a man can only vote at that place in which he is a resident, but we have a very simple provision by which, if a man's name is properly added to the list, say in the city of St. John, and he moved before the election to, say, the city of Moncton, his name could be easily transferred from the list for the city of St. John to

that for the city of Moncton, and he would vote in the city of Moncton. Would the minister think that section 143 would override the provisions of our Act as to residence and the right of a man to have his name transferred from his former residence to his present residence?

Mr. DOHERTY: That question has just been brought to my attention. I have not had an opportunity of giving any thought to it, and I would not like to pronounce an offhand opinion on the point. I think my hon. friend will recognize that this is a different question from the one put by the hon. member for Middlesex (Mr. Ross).

Mr. CARVELL: Yes, it is.

Mr. DOHERTY: The hon. member for Middlesex (Mr. Ross) had spoken to me about the question during the course of the afternoon, and thus I had an opportunity of looking into it.

Mr. CARVELL: In view of the great difficulties that may arise in our province, may I suggest that the minister give a decision on this point, which decision should be made public. I am satisfied if this were done it would be in the interests of everybody.

Mr. DOHERTY: I shall be glad to do so.

PROROGATION OF PARLIAMENT.

Mr. SPEAKER read a communication from the Governor General's secretary, announcing that His Excellency would proceed to the Senate Chamber this afternoon at 5.30, for the purpose of proroguing the present session of Parliament.

At that hour, a message was delivered by Lieutenant-Colonel Ernest J. Chambers, Gentleman Usher of the Black Rod, as follows:

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

Accordingly, Mr. Speaker, with the House, went to the Senate Chamber.

In the Senate Chamber His Excellency the Governor General was pleased to give, in His Majesty's name, the Royal Assent to the following Bills:

An Act respecting the Minister of the Overseas Forces, the Parliamentary Secretary of the Department of Militia and Defence, and the Parliamentary Under-Secretary of State for External Affairs.

An Act respecting Game in the Northwest Territories.

An Act to amend The Meat and Canned Foods Act.

An Act to amend An Act in aid of Provincial Legislation prohibiting or restricting the sale or use of Intoxicating Liquors.

An Act providing for the acquisition by His Majesty of the capital stock of the Canadian Northern Railway Company.

An Act to incorporate the Imperial Order Daughters of the Empire and the Children of the Empire (Junior Branch).

An Act respecting Live Stock.

An Act to amend the Criminal Code (respecting Insurance).

An Act to authorize the levying of a War Tax upon certain incomes.

An Act to incorporate The Army and Navy Veterans in Canada.

An Act to amend The Companies Act.

An Act to amend The Dry Docks Subsidies Act, 1910.

An Act respecting Insurance.

The Military Voters Act, 1917.

An Act concerning the payment of salaries or wages of employees of railway companies, and to otherwise amend The Railway Act.

The War Time Elections Act.

An Act to amend the Judges Act.

An Act relating to War Charities.

To these Bills the Royal Assent was pronounced by the Clerk of the Senate in the following words:

In His Majesty's name, his Excellency the Governor General doth assent to these Bills.

Then the hon. the Speaker of the House of Commons addressed His Excellency the Governor General as follows:

May it please Your Excellency:

The Commons of Canada have voted the Supplies required to enable the Government to defray the expenses of the Public Service.

In the name of the Commons, I present to Your Excellency the following Bills:—

"An Act for granting to His Majesty certain sums of money for the public service of the financial year ending the 31st March, 1918.

An Act for granting to His Majesty certain sums of money for the public service of the financial year ending the 31st March, 1918."

to which Bills I humbly request Your Excellency's assent.

To these Bills the Clerk of the Senate by command of His Excellency the Governor General did thereupon say:

In His Majesty's name, His Excellency the Governor General thanks His Loyal Subjects, accepts their benevolence, and assents to these Bills.

After which His Excellency the Governor General was pleased to close the Seventh Session of the Twelfth Parliament of the Dominion with the following Speech:

Honourable Gentlemen of the Senate:

Gentlemen of the House of Commons:

Important measures for the effective prosecution of the war have engaged your close attention during a long session, and I am now happy to release you from further attendance.

Since your labours began, the high and worthy character of our cause has been confirmed by two significant events. Our allies,

the Russian people, are engaged under trying circumstances, in establishing institutions which shall fully conform to their ideals of liberty and order. In the midst of inevitable difficulties, which command our sympathy, they have affirmed their determination to remain faithful to the Alliance.

The United States of America, refusing to tolerate the arrogance and menace of Prussian Militarism have made common cause with the Allies and are vigorously co-operating in the struggle for freedom and humanity. Already the Canadian people have given many expressions of the warm welcome with which they greet their great kindred neighbour as a comrade in arms.

The meetings of the Imperial War Cabinet and Imperial War Conference in the early part of the year have very materially facilitated the thorough co-operation of the Dominion, both in the prosecution of the war and in preparation for the future. They constitute also an important step in the development of constitutional relationships between the nations of the British Commonwealth.

Notwithstanding the increasing military strength of the allied nations, the stubborn resistance of the enemy in all important theatres of the war demonstrates the need of throwing our utmost effort into the struggle and thus hastening the day of abiding peace. In the western theatre the Canadian Army Corps, by its capture of the coveted Vimy Ridge and by its recent operations at Lens, has sustained its distinguished record and contributed in important measure to the ascendancy which the Allies have gained in that theatre.

In order to secure the reinforcements essential for the support of our forces further steps have become necessary, and the authority you have granted for compulsory military enlistment on a selective basis will meet the urgent need for reinforcements. At the same time it will provide the means for conserving more effectively the essential agricultural and industrial activities of the Dominion.

You have recognized your duty in providing the best possible safeguards for enabling those engaged in the defence of their country to have their voice in the decision of national questions which vitally affect them. For this purpose, as well as to give due recognition to service and sacrifice in the affairs of the State, the necessary adjustments which you have made in the legislation relevant to these matters will doubtless prove effective.

The legislation you have passed for the purpose of assisting returned soldiers to settle upon the land will not only aid materially in restoring these gallant men to their rightful status in the community but should greatly increase the agricultural production of the country.

The appointment of a Food Controller and of a Fuel Controller invested with important powers and duties is founded upon the impressive need of the utmost economy and saving in order that our national strength may continue unimpaired.

In order that our industries may be equipped to cope with the intricate problems of the future, provision has been wisely made for promoting scientific and industrial research.

Important progress has been made in solving our difficult problems of railway transportation, and the means have been provided whereby a great railway system shall become the property of the people of Canada and be added to their national undertakings;

Gentlemen of the House of Commons:

In the name of His Majesty I thank you for the liberal provision you have made for the needs of the public service and for the prosecution of the war.

Hounourable Gentlemen of the Senate:

Gentlemen of the House of Commons:

Although the stress of the war becomes increasingly severe, the people of Canada, resolute in the supreme purpose of achieving through victory an abiding peace, have not faltered; and I am confident that whatever further efforts are necessary will be unhesitatingly put forth in the stern determination that the vast sacrifices already made shall not be in vain.

The Speaker of the Senate then said:

It is His Excellency the Governor General's will and pleasure, that this Parliament be prorogued until Thursday, the 1st day of November next, to be here holden, and this Parliament is accordingly prorogued until Thursday, the 1st day of November next.

INDEX

SEVENTH SESSION—TWELFTH PARLIAMENT, 1917

Abbreviations.—1r., 2r., 3r.=first, second, or third reading. Amdt.=Amendment. Com.=Committee. Con.=Consideration. Div.=Division. M.=Motion. Ref.=Reference. Rep.=Report. Res.=Resolution. Sec.=Section.

Abbotsford postmaster, 608

Achim, Mr. Honoré (Labelle)
Military Service Bill, 2873

Address in reply to the Governor General's Speech, 9, 47, 83, 119, 160, 195, 249

Address to His Majesty the King. *See* Parliament: Extension of term of

Adjournment moved to discuss matter of urgent public importance
Mr. Pardee, returned soldiers, 459
Mr. Lemieux, liquor in military camps, 806
Mr. Kyte, price of flour, 1039
Mr. Devlin, conservation of grain, 1176
Mr. Macdonald, German submarines, 1320
Mr. Oliver, removal of rails, 1820
Mr. Turriff, farm labour, 3504
Mr. Macdonald, munitions, 5517

Adulteration of food. *See* Food

Advertising, government
Department of the Secretary of State, 656
Recruiting, 986, 3136

Aeroplane. *See* Air service *and* Aviation

Aetna Explosives Company, 4508

Agriculture
Animals
Health of, 2271
Loaning of to farmers, 4152
Pure bred, purchase of, 2276
See, under this head, Live stock.
Apples, embargo on export of, 5776
Associations, 2276
Beans for seed, 671, 1473
Bulletins, 2062, 2274
Butter
Imports and exports of, 1573
Purchases by British Government, 899
Cattle. *See, under this head,* Live stock
Cheese
Imports and exports of, 1573
Manufacturing and curing of, 2265
Purchase of by British Government, 1774, 1863, 1971, 2197, 2257, 2265, 2267, 2557
See also Food

Agriculture—*Con.*
Dairy industry, 953, 2075, 2256
Department
Estimates, 654, 2062, 2255, 2924, 3744, 4677
French-speaking employees of, 2262, 2265
Publications 2062, 2274
Staff and salaries, 4924
Development of, 2578
Exhibitions, 2260, 2270
Experimental farms, 2055, 2063, 4682
Hay
Embargo on, 1222
Imports and exports of, 1574
Inspection and grading of, 3402
Purchases of by British Government, 5086
Hogs
Inspection of, 2271
Cholera, 2273
Insect pests, 2066, 2075
Labourers. *See* Labour
Horses, compensation for destruction of, 2056
Live stock
British embargo on, 918, 987, 1535
Pure bred, purchase of, 2276
Shipments, inspection of, 1841
See also Live stock and Produce Bill
Noxious weeds, 2068
Parcel post shipments, 2072
Plant diseases
Rust in wheat, 2063, 2067
Powdery scab in potatoes, 2269, 5991
Potatoes
Accumulation of on railways, 607
Duty, proposed removal, 703, 5274, 5777, 5982
Exports and imports of, 2267, 5982
Powdery scab, 2269, 5991
Prices and supply of, 936, 1087, 1189, 1437, 2095
Seed, 1473
Straw, utilization of, 4683
Veterinary Director General, 987
See also Cold storage, *and* Food

Agricultural Instruction Act
Administration of, 3755
Payments to Prince Edward Island under, 455

Aiken, Mr. G. O., employment of, 4151, 4503

Air Service, 805, 1039, 1127, 1331. *See* Aviation

Alase, Motor boat, 5360

Alberta, enlistments in, 3373, 3375

Alcohol
Distillation of, 3742
Public institutions, for, 5103

Alcoholic liquors
Revenue from sale and manufacture of, 304
Sale of to soldiers. *See* Army: camps
See also Intoxicating liquors, Prohibition *and* Grain

Aldershot camp. *See* Army

Aliens
Armenians and Assyrians, franchise rights of under War-time Elections Act, 5421
Disfranchisement of, 1862, 5416
Enlistment of, 4413, 4415
Homestead rights of, 3808
Naturalization of, 3810

Ames, Sir Herbert B. (Montreal, St Antoine)
Budget, 742
The tariff, 742
Government expenditure, 743
Building of highways, 744
Taxation of business profits, 745
Debt of Canada, 745
Military Service, 2738
Contravention of Act, 3346
Enforcement, 2744
Exemptions, 3220
Petitions for and against, 2738
Recruiting, progress of, 2742
Patriotic Fund
Disbursements, 378, 382
Pensions, 382
Pensions, military, 1615
Soldier Settlement Board, 3785
Soldiers
Assigned pay of, 384
Pay of, 3215
Returned, provision for, 756
Voting of, 4781, 4912
Taxation of incomes, 4084, 4095, 4099, 4641, 4647
Unclaimed bank balances, 1008
War charities, 6064

American Turf Association, 47

Amqui-St. Leonard mail contract, 3903

Anderson, Mr. David, employment of, 1265

Angers, Captain, dismissal of, 758

Anglo-French delegates, visit of to Canada, 669

Apples, embargo on export of, 5776

Appropriation Acts
1. Bill No. 20 (for 1916-17, $9,127,777.42; for 1917-18, $32,195,144). Res., 1r., 2r., com., 3r., 584
2. Bill No. 108 (for 1917-18, $24,054,845.38). Res., 1r., 2947; 2r., com., 3r., 3086
3. Bill No. 128 (for 1916-17, $4,821,217.80). Res., 1r., 5242; 2r., com., 3r., 5275
4. Bill No. 135 (for 1917-18, $51,096,767.05). Res., 1r., 2r., com., 6061; 3r., 6062

Archives, Public
Expenses, 5791
Records, 3742

Armstrong, Mr. J. A. M. (North York)
Military service, 2546
Railway mail service, 2244

Armstrong, Mr. Joseph E. (East Lambton)
Canadian Northern railway, acquisition of, 4496, 5160
Fuel, 1405
Government Railways Act amendment, 4350
Intoxicating liquor, prohibition of, 4399
Railway Act, the, 3422-3453, 3511-3553, 3592-3609, 3717

Armstrong, S. A., position of, 802

Army
Allowances
Dependents of men joining British Army, to, 385
London offices, to soldiers employed in, 5915
Separation, 336, 382, 383, 387, 1191, 3075, 4001
Subsistence, 4001
Assigned pay, 383
Badges of identification, 5953
Bands, regimental, 4044
Battalions
Forestry
List of, 4509
Recruiting for, 5703
Wages paid in, 3950, 3509
60th, 525
105th. Supply Officer Lieut. R. J. Moffat, 5361
122nd, 5083
156th, 523
167th, 5272
Camps
Aldershot, 3295, 3419
Borden, 96, 100, 101

Army—*Con.*
Intoxicating liquor in, 535, 806, 1226, 1266, 1561, 1567
Petewawa land claims, 5241
Training, in Canada, 899
Canteen system in England, 718
Casualties
June 30, 1916, to June 5, 1917, 2201
June, 1917, 3719
July, 1917, 4151
August 16-31, 1917, 5901
Civil servants, in, pay and allowance to, 663, 713
Classifications, 2185
Commissions, granting of, 203, 207
Conscription. *See* Military service
Demobilization plans, 3118
Dental Service, 31
Officers, 1574, 4009
Desertions, 338, 3111
Discharge
Purchase of, 3111
Regulations governing, 3096, 3098
Table of, 3096
Total to June 30, 1917, 4152
Work-pay, on, 457
Divisions, 459, 2186
Enlistment
Aliens, of, 4413, 4415. *See below* Persons of foreign birth
British army, in, 385
Civil Service, from. *See* Civil Service
Different units, in, 29, 245
Farmers, of, 4685
Figures
April 30, 1917, to, 1572
June 30, 1917, to, 4152
July, 1917, 4151
Generally, 2411, 2442, 2446-2451, 2454, 2463-2478, 2573, 2583, 2600, 2624, 2631, 2647, 2855, 2884, 2904
Moosejaw, at, 5122
Non-residents, of, 1476
Persons of foreign birth, 3656, 3759. *See above,* Aliens
Provinces, by, 216, 221
Unfit men, of, 697, 3099, 3107, 4003
Urban and rural, 3135
Western provinces, from, 4685
Equipment, 23. *See also* War supplies
Expeditionary force
Command of, 28, 268
Conditions governing in respect of British Government, 1576
Control of by Canada, 20, 39
Disposition of, 268, 1816, 2356
Holiday for, proposed, 5902, 6065
Status of, 259
Terms respecting enlistment in, 1576
Fifth Canadian Division, command of, 459
Highland Brigade, 458, 552, 556
Hospitals. *See that title*
Irish-Canadian Rangers, 458
Medical service. *See* Canadian Army Medical Service
Non-commisisoned officers, 1608
Officers
Alleged surplus of, 3102
Appointments, charges regarding, 98
Mentioned in despatches, 4062
Pay of, 1628, 1673, 5773
Reversion in ranks, 3997, 5773
Retention of on leave, 5902
Salutes to, 5424
Unemployed, 560, 3102
Wives of, passports for, 3996
For individual officers see their names
Overseas Department
Officers employed by, 6069
See also under this head Expeditionary force
Pay and Records office, staff of, 3104
Pensions. *See that title*
Recruiting
Advertising in connection with, 986, 3136
Civil Service, from. *See that title*
Correspondence between Prime Minister and ex-minister of Militia, 2446, 3086
Expenses, 1959
Folkstone Director of, 1226
Forestry battalions, for, 5703
Generally, 51, 69, 86, 98, 101, 269, 559, 2395, 3371
Irish, Mr. Mark, statements of, 2707
Medical examination of recruits, 3098, 3963, 3967
National service proposals, 360
Officers
Bonaventure county, 1675
Cape Breton, 5361
Quebec, 3135
Rimouski, 456
Orders in Council respecting, 2482
Provinces, by, 2511. *See also under titles of Provinces*
Retarding of, alleged, 3086, 3110
Statement by Prime Minister, 194
System of, 360, 372
United States
British subjects in, 2482
Canadians in, 3758, 3759, 3904, 4466
Regiments
104th, 1570
165th, 1725
Reinforcements. *See* Military Service

Army—*Con.*
Rejected men
Certificates to, 5423
Disposition of, 3099
Rum, issues of, 535, 536
Soldiers
Age of on enlisting, 3577, 3993, 4001
Attendance of at political meetings, 4338, 5231
Deceased, estates of, 3805
See also Soldier Settlement Board
Employment of on farms, 1677
Former occupation of, 4685
Graves of, 1534
Leave of absence, 4005, 4055
Life insurance of, 3557, 3589
Mail matter for, 1263, 3644
Pay
Assigned, 383
Increases in, proposed, 2603, 5223
Promotion, in cases of, 5423, 5773
Working, 457
Personal requests concerning, 4203
Public meetings, attendance of at, 4338, 5231
Returned
Badges for, 5953
Care of, 10, 67, 587, 1586, 1594
Committee on, 459, 524, 756
Employment of, 3846
Camp Kapuskasing at, 5422
Government service in, 491, 1127, 1850, 1858, 1884, 6054
Pensions, scale of, 1594
See also Soldier Settlement Board *and* Pensions
Reversions in rank; pay in such cases, 5423
Voting of, 87, 223, 452, 1383, 2403, 2557, 2651, 2850, 3727, 4406, 4688, 4693, 4740, 4792, 4874, 5195. *See also* Military Voters Bill *and* War-time Elections Bill
Widows of, 3805
Working pay, cessation of, 457
For individual soldiers see their names
Soldier Settlement Board. *See that title*
Substitutes, buying of, 3113
Troops
Alleged stoning of, 803, 2756
Despatch of to the front, 574
Local, supplies for
Pictou, N.S., contracts, 303
Trenton, N.S., contracts, 303
Maintenance of at the front, 536
United States, training of in Canada, 2482

Army—*Con.*
Unfit men
Certificates to, 5423
Utilization of, 3099
Veterans. *See* Army and Navy Veterans Incorporation Bill
Work pay, cessation of, 457
See also Military Service *and* War
Army Act. *See* Military Service Bill
Army and Navy Veterans of Canada Incorporation Bill, 1r., 5421. 2r., 5541. 3r., 5910
Arthurs, Mr. James (Parry Sound)
Army
Officers, surplus of, 3103
Pensions, 3218
Rejected men, 3101
Soldiers, voting of, 4716, 4761, 4777, 4813, 4825, 4895
Immigration from the United States, 1750
Military Service Bill, 2654
Soldiers, attendance of at political meetings, 4338, 5231
Arthurs, Lieut.-Col. James, position and pay of, 5914
Ashcroft-Fort George mail service, 668
Assyrians, franchise rights under War-time Elections Bill, 5421
Astronomical Surveys, 4917
Athletic Associations, incorporation of, 5922
Atholstan, Lord, dynamite plot against, 5360
Atlantic mail service, 452
Atlantic Patrol Service. *See* Naval Service
Auditor General
Office of, 1791
Report of, 1469
Austro-Germans in western provinces, 1265
Aviation
Canadian fund, 5362
Corps, enlistment in, 1886
See Air Service
Babtie, Dr., report of. *See* Canadian Army Medical Service
Baddeck mail contract, 1819
Bags, duty on. *See* Customs
Balfour, Rt. Hon. Arthur J.
Announcement of visit of, 613, 1724
Reception to, 1766
Speech of, 1767
Bank Act Amendment Bills
1. Bill No. 46, Mr. L. A. Lapointe, 1r., 1037
2. Bill No. 56, Sir Thomas White, 1r., 1773; withdrawn, 2008

Bank Act Amendment Bills—*Con.*
3 Bill No. 65, Sir Thomas White,—loans on farmers' live stock. Res., 1960; 1r., 1971; 2r., (referred to Banking and Commerce Committee), 2149

Bank of Commerce, Canadian, 4686

Banks and banking
Savings deposits, 4685
Unclaimed bank balances, 1001

Barnard, Mr. Geo. H. (Victoria, B.C.)
Judges' salaries, 1976
Railway Act, The, 3529

Barrette, Mr. Joseph A. (Berthier)
Gauthier, Mr. L. J., denial of statements of, 2570
Halifax Chronicle, statement in, 3352
Military Service Bill, 2521
Amendment proposed, 2524
Opposition to compulsory service, 2522
Referendum proposals, 2523

Bartlett, Major, position of, 4292, 4416, 5422

Bathurst harbour improvements, 3872

Baugh, Edward Levi
Defalcations of, 1470
Release of, 2481

Baxter, Leslie E., employment of, 3418

Bawdy houses. *See* Criminal Code Amendment Bills

Bay State Fish Company, 2321

Beans. *See* Agriculture.

Bear River, N.S.
Indian agents, 1569
Post office site, 1378, 1569

Béland, Hon. H. S., M.P., detention of in Germany, 311, 341, 524

Belford, Major J. F., position of, 5703

Bell, Mr. Graham, pay of, 1129

Bell, steamer, 1377.

Bell Telephone Company, 3548

Bell Telephone Memorial Association, 5780

Bellemare, Mr. A. (Maskinongé)
Address in reply to the Governor General's Speech, 294
Military service, 294, 2823, 3573

Bennett, Mr. R. B. (Calgary)
Bishop of Mackenzie River, 868
Canadian Northern railway, acquisition of, 4566, 4627-4638, 5149
Civil Service salaries, 2248
Companies, incorporation of, 5924-5942
Government railways, rolling stock, 4931
Gwatkin, General, 4428

Bennett, Mr. R. B.—*Con.*
Intercolonial railway
Operation of, 786
Reply to Mr. Graham's statement, 805
Intoxicating liquors, prohibition of, 4402
Legislators, free transportation for, 4936
Live stock exchanges, 5506, 5509
McLeod-Tellier Commission, 5252, 5259
Military Service Bill, 4664
Mounted Police, Royal Northwest, 4669, 4672
Overseas Military Forces, minister of, 4428
Pensions, 6023
Railways
Material for France, 1830
Private cars, 4937
Transportation for legislators, 4936
Soldiers, voting of, 1403, 4902
War-time Elections Bill, 5614
Woman suffrage, 1510

Bennett, Mr. W. H. (East Simcoe)
Flour, price of, 1048
Gordon Divorce Bill, 5499, 5904
Insurance Act amendment, 1037, 1157, 1524, 1568
National Transcontinental Railway—solicitor's fees, 454
War-time Elections Bill, 5681, 5870

Berlinguet, Thomas F. X., employment of, 1381

Bernard, Lieut.-Col. E. S., position of, 5703

Best, Mr. John A. (Dufferin)
Rankin, Captain Ramsay, 987
Troops, alleged stoning of, 803

Bickerdike, Mr. Robert (Montreal, St. Lawrence)
Capital punishment
Abolition of, 46, 325, 617, 1028
Proposed plebiscite, 1016
Russia, in, 1012
Spain case, the, 1018
Women and children, 1017, 1150
Cattle, British embargo on, 920
Dubreuil, Mr., dismissal of, 3635
Prisoners, proposed enlistment of, 1012, 1015
War-time Elections Bill, 5600

Bigamy. *See* Criminal Code Amendment Bills

Bigras, Gedéon, dynamite plot against, 5360

Bills. *See their titles*

Binder twine, 3233.

Blain, Lieut. Roswell, position of, 4245

Blain, Mr. Richard (Peel)
Army
Camps, sale of liquor in, 824
Recruiting, 3377

Blain, Mr. Richard—*Con.*
Parliament, extension of term of, 3483
Pensions, 1606
Technical education, 1240
Blondin, Hon. P. E. (Postmaster General)
Alleged statements of on conscription, 250, 339
Recruiting by in Montreal, 4415
Board of Grain Supervisors
Appointment of, 2236, 3692
Powers of, 3696, 5206
Boards of Trade Act Amendment Bill. 1r., 3609. 2r., 3657. Com., 3657. 3r., 3905
Boivin, Mr. George H. (Shefford)
Alliance Nationale, 1547
Emigration restrictions, 1726
House of Commons, payment of sessional indemnity to members, 6045
Inland Revenue Department officials, 3819
Intoxicating liquor, trade in, 3818
Military Service Bill, 2833
Extension of the term of Parliament, 2834
Vacancies in Parliament, 2836
Petitions against conscription, 2837
Recruiting in Quebec, 2841
Amendement of Mr. Barrette, 2844
Contraventions of Act, 3349
Parliamentary procedure, amendment of Mr. Barrette, 2844
Renault, Raoul, appointment of, 2374
Soldiers, voting of, 4906
War-time Elections Bill, 5626
Bolduc, Hon. Joseph, address to Mr. Balfour, 1767
Bonaventure county
Breakwater, 988
Mail service, 1126
Recruiting officer, 1675
Borden, Rt. Hon. Sir Robert (Prime Minister)
Address in reply to the Governor General's Speech, 25
Appreciation of His Royal Highness the Duke of Connaught, 25
The New Governor General, 26
Newfoundland and Canada, 26
Great Britain's part in the war, 26
Progress of the war, 27, 44
Canadian overseas forces, 28
Military Hospitals Commission, 31
Canadian Dental Service, 31
Production of munitions, 31, 36
War Purchasing Commission, 32
Transportation of war supplies, 33, 36
Financial, industrial and trade conditions, 33
Extension of term of Parliament, 37
Borden, Rt. Hon. Sir R.—*Con.*
The fiftieth anniversary of Confederation, 38
The record of the present government, 38
Control of Canadian military forces, 39
Military equipment, 40
Imperial War Conference, 42
Peace proposals, 43
Army
Act, regulations of, 3114
Available men, 2390
Canteens, open, 537
Classifications, 2185
Demobilization plans 3120
Dental Service, 31
Enlistment of persons of foreign birth, 3759
Equipment, 40, 556
Expeditionary force, suggested holiday for, 6065
Highland Brigade, 556
Medical Service, 464, 531, 601, 1864, 3970, 4954
Overseas forces
Control of, 39
Maintenance of, 357
Pay and Records Office, 3105
Pensions, 332, 1613
Rejected men, 3099
Separation allowances, 386
Soldiers
Graves, 1534
Returned, care of, 462, 524, 587
Voting of, 4805, 4819, 4880-4887, 4890
Troops, maintenance of at the front, 356
Balfour, Rt. Hon. A. J., address to, 1771
Béland, Hon. Dr., M.P., efforts for release of, 311
Bruce, Dr., report of. *See* Medical service
Canadian Northern Railway, acquisition of 4027, 4216, 4240, 4478, 4867, 4873, 5015, 5112
Canadian Patriotic Fund, 3078
Civil Service, promotions, 4666
Coal
Confiscation of by railways, 195, 334
Western mining of, 341, 523, 2570, 2609
Coalition government. *See under this title,* Union Government
Confederation, fiftieth anniversary of, 38, 524
Conscription. *See* Military Service
Customs duty on Crown's goods, 1981
Defence of Canada, 359
Farm labour, 3506
"Fiddlers, The," forbidden circulation of, 3503, 3654, 3718, 3955, 4059

Borden, Rt. Hon. Sir R.—*Con.*
Galt, Mr. Justice, investigation into report of, 2056
Gauthier, Mr. L. J., denial of statements of, 2570
Gordon Divorce Bill, 5903
High Commissioner, Canadian, office of, 4177
Hospitals, military, 464
House of Commons
Business of the House
Morning sittings, 2619, 2775, 2833
Saturday sittings, 324, 2569
Wednesday sittings, 324
Mace, new, 1468
Members, tributes to deceased, 3
Officials
Appointments, 586
Clerk of the House, retirement of, 6069
Sergeant-at-arms, death of, 6069
Imperial Munitions Board, labour, 1986
Imperial War Cabinet and Imperial War Conference
Adjournment of House for, 117, 597, 603
Announcement *re* meeting of, 42
Correspondence respecting, 5, 24
Proceedings, 1525
Cattle embargo, 1535
Dominions overseas, constitutional relations of, 1528, 1531
Development and control of natural resources, 1532
France, visit to, 1536
Imperial preference, 1532
India, representation of, 1534
Minutes of, 2354
Soldiers' graves, 1534
Statements by British Prime Minister, 2354
Judges' salaries, 5955
Labour bureaus, establishment of, 118
Lake of the Woods water level, 2775
Landry, Mr. Justice, finding of, 3110, 3615
Lessard, General, 364
Mace, vote of thanks to donors of, 1468
Members of Parliament, tributes to deceased, 3
Military Service Bill
Introduction, 1542, 2184
Amendment of Mr. Copp, 3078
Appeals, 2191, 3178
Army Act, regulations of, 3114
Available men, 2390
Board of Selection, 5083
Canada's position in the war, 2184
Contraventions of Act, 3342-3351, 3361, 3588
Exemptions, 3208, 3363, 6068
Exceptions, 3559

Borden, Rt. Hon. Sir R.—*Con.*
General provisions, 3239, 3259
Militia Act, provisions of, 2187
Necessity for reinforcements, 2187
Persons liable for service, 3116
Registrars, 5900
Senate amendments, 4663
Tribunals, 2190, 3152
Mounted Police, Royal Northwest, 4174, 4667
National Service Commission, 309, 370
Nationalist Party, 4564
O'Connor, Mr. W. F., report of, 3745, 3747, 3749
Overseas Military Forces, Minister of, 4196, 4417, 4436
Parliament, extension of term of, 37, 3419, 3504
Parliament, printing of, 5950
Parliamentary procedure
Order of the day, reinstatement of, 2877
Question of privilege, discussion on, 600
Votes and proceedings, correctness of entry in, 2880
Parliamentary Secretaryships, 4196, 4417, 4438
Peace terms, consultation with Dominions on, 300
Pensions, 6018
Pension Commissioners, 4958
Political deadlock, rumoured, 1971
Press censorship, 3654, 3718, 3955, 4059
Racing meets, limitation of, 323
Railway Act, The, 603
Railways
Employees, payment of salaries of, 5956
Material, removal of to France, 310
Traffic, congestion of, 587
Recruiting
Alleged statement regarding, 194
Correspondence with ex-Minister of Militia, 2446, 3086, 3371
Figures for 1916, 379
Retarding of, alleged, 3371
Systems explained, 360-382, 2482
Rogers, Hon. Robert, resignation of, 4736
Ross rifle, 392, 408-434, 477-522
Speaker, election of, 1
Taxation of incomes, 4655
Union Government
Correspondence with Sir Wilfrid Laurier, 2690
Rumoured political deadlock, 1971
Votes and proceedings, correctness of entry in, 2880
War
Expenditure, 354, 476
Requirements. *See* Military Service

Borden, Rt. Hon. Sir R.—*Con.*
Supplies—clothing, motor trucks, Oliver equipment, wagons, 556-558
Trophies, exhibit of, 6003
War Purchasing Commission, 32
War-time Elections Bill, 5576, 5648-5702,
War vote ($500,000,000), 354, 586 5706, 5805, 5834, 6071
Woman suffrage, 1504
Yukon price advances, 2199

Boulay, Mr. Herménégilde (Rimouski)
Agriculture Department, French-speaking employes of, 2262, 2265
Army Medical Service, 3989
Bright, the late John, 987
Budget, 1085
Free wheat, 1085
Behaviour of soldiers passing through Quebec, 1086
Necessity for co-operation with the Government, 1087
Civil Service
Employment of men in higher offices, 1256
French-speaking employees, 2262, 2265, 2340, 2759
Salaries, 2239, 2251
Government railways
Accidents, 1376
Operation and management of, 3389
Removal of obstructions, 595
Rolling stock, 594
St. Fabien crossing, 2226, 3389
Government Railways Act amendment, 4373, 4382
Interior Department, French-speaking employees, 2340
Mail service, 3640
McWilliams, Mr., dismissal of, 2167
Military Service Bill
Authority of Parliament, 2761
Classes, 3353
Exceptions, 3571
Exemptions, 3190, 3306
Quebec, position of, 2754
National Transcontinental Railway
Express service, 595
Fitzpatrick yard and engineer's residence, 455, 456
Telegraph line, 456
Ottawa Citizen, statement of, 2776
Parliament buildings, destruction of—indemnities for losses, 4413
Pension Commissioner's staff, 608
Quebec
Recruiting in, 2754
Troops passing through, insults to, 2756
Railway Act, The, 3435, 3511

Boulay, Mr. Hermenegilde—*Con.*
Rimouski
Government employees, 2165
Recruiting officers, 456
St. Lawrence signal and telegraph service, 1471
Scientific and industrial research, 3957
Senate, proposed change in constitution of, 1145
South African war, 2200
Steamship services, 2323
Technical education, 1249
Telegraph and telephone lines, 5384
Troops, alleged insults to, 2756
Veterinary Director General, 987

Bourassa, Mr. J. Boutin (Lévis)
Gravel, Lieut. Gedéon, 1674
Gravelle, Oscar, 1226
Levis railway station, 1129
Military Service Bill, 3069, 3147
St. Romuald public works, 1129

Boy Scouts Association, 2062, 3740

Boyce, Mr. Arthur C. (West Algoma)
Military Service, 3147

Boyce, George H., position of, 1472

Boyer, Mr. Gustave (Vaudreuil)
Butter and cheese purchases, 899
Maple sugar—adulteration, 1958
Military service, 2931

Boys, Mr. W. A. (South Simcoe)
Address in reply to the Governor General's Speech, 90
Patriotism of Canadian women, 90
Simcoe county and the war, 90
Loyal Orange Order, 91
The Dorchester election, 92
National service, 93
Recruiting in Quebec, 94

Bradbury, Mr. George H. (Selkirk)
Army canteens, 811
Army and navy veterans, 5910
Capital punishment, 634
Dominion Lands Act amendment, 3799
Military service, 3190
United Grain Growers, Limited, 893
War affairs, Government administration of, 3383

Brampton-Palestine mail route, 590

Bran. *See* Grain

Brantford moulders' strike, 2322

Breadner, Mr. R. W., position of, 3676

Bright, the late John, 987

Brindle, Mr. William, dismissal of, 3758

British Admiralty, recruiting in Canada for, 4159, 4163

British Cattle Supply Company, 1817

British Columbia Indian Commission, 653, 1896

British Government and Canadian Pacific Railway Financial Arrangements Bill, 1r., 1369. 2r., 2059. Com., 2059. Rep., 2061, 3r., 2139

British Government, war supplies, purchases of in Canada, 4953, 5517, 5541

Bromptonville postmaster, 1129.

Brouillard, Mr. Ovide (Drummond and Arthabaska)
- Ætna Explosives Company, 4508
- Military service, 3072

Bruce, Dr., investigations of. *See* Canadian Army Medical Service

Buchanan, Mr. W. A. (Medicine Hat)
- Army allowances, subsistence, 5915
- Canadian Northern Railway, acquisition of, 5178
- Coal mining, western, 119, 458, 523, 1266, 1372, 1616, 1723, 1725, 2526, 2570, 2653
- Coutts quarantine reserve, 590
- Economic and Development Commission, 1125
- Farm labour, 3507
- Fuel, 1414
- Grain
  - Commission, 3711
  - Elevators, 986
  - Seed, advances for, 303, 305
- Home guard duty, 336
- Hudson's Bay Company lands, taxation of, 986
- Hyde, Mr. J. W., 301
- Indian reserves, 989, 2389
- Judgments, uniform interest on, 900
- Letter carriers' salaries, 1474
- Medicine Hat military reserve, 301
- Military service, 2600
  - Exemptions, 2607
  - Referendum proposals, 2607
  - Taxation of wealth, 2608
- Mounted Police pensions, 5701
- Oil-boring machinery, 301
- Proportional representation, 913
- School lands, western, 1378
- Shaw, Mr. F. D., dismissal of, 1847
- Soldier Settlement Board, 1163
- Soldiers, former occupations of, 4685
- Taxation
  - Farm implements, 1686
  - Hudson's Bay Co. Lands, 986
  - Income, 1687, 4122
  - Wealth, 2608
- Unclaimed bank balances, 1009
- War-time Elections Bill, 5580
- Woman suffrage, 1515

Budget debate, 718. Amdts. proposed: Mr. Turriff, 750, 845, 870, 937, 1085, 1089, 1194, 1201, 1267; Mr. Robb, 1317, 1319, 1423; Mr. Oliver, 1424. Mr. Loggie, 1424. *See also* Taxation.

Bull, Mr. Perkins, position of, 1130

Bureau, Mr. Jacques (Three Rivers and St. Maurice)
- Berlinguet, Thos. F. X., 1381
- Canadian Northern Railway, acquisition of, 5016, 5168
- Industrial requirements, 2696
- Inland Revenue Department estimates, 3835
- Military service, 2693, 5882
- Montreal Gazette, statement of, 2709, 4739
- Public Works Department architect, 5104
- Quebec judges' salaries, 5798, 5800
- St. Maurice river improvements, 1381
- Taxation of incomes, 5886
- Three Rivers
  - Harbour improvements, 3879
  - Public building, 668
- War-time Elections Bill, 5667, 5695, 5712-5771

Burford, recruiting in, 601

Burgess, defalcations of, 1127

Burke, Col. Rev. A. E., position of, 5704

Burnham, Mr. John H. (West Peterborough)
- Aliens, enlistment of, 4415
- Army
  - Camps, sale of liquor in, 817
  - Enlisted men, age of, 3577
  - Pensions, 1594
  - Unfit men, 699
- Assistant Deputy Minister of Labour, suspension of, 6911
- Capital punishment, 623
- Civil Service, appointments, 2019
- Government Railways Act amendment, 4355
- Grain for breweries and distilleries, 1179
- Intoxicating liquors, prohibition of, 4403
- Judges' salaries, 1977
- Labour—Industrial Disputes Investigation Act, 1112
- Military Service Bill, 2555, 3365
- Parliamentary secretaryships, 4204
- Patent medicines, war tax on, 363
- Shipbuilding, 1932
- Soldiers, voting of, 2557
- Soldier Settlement Board, 3630
- Technical education, 1238
- Trent canal wharves, 759
- Venereal diseases, 817, 869

Burrell, Hon. Martin (Minister of Agriculture)
Agriculture Department
Estimates, 654, 2062, 2255, 3744, 4677
French-speaking employees in, 2263
Publications, 2274
Animals
Health of, 2271
Pure bred, purchase of, 2276
Cattle, British embargo on, 921
Cheese
Purchases by British Government, 1971, 2197, 2257, 2267
Regulations regarding manufacture of, 2267
Cold storage plants, 2076, 2256
Exhibitions, 2261, 2270
Experimental farms, 4682
Flax industry, 4683
Food supplies for Great Britain, 2260
Grain
Diseases—rust, 2064
Seed, 1188, 4677
Hogs
Inspection of, 2271
Cholera, 2273
Live Stock and Produce Bill, 4287, 5503
Pelagic Sealing Treaty, claims under, 5970
Potatoes
Powdery scab, 2269
Supply of, 936, 1088, 1189, 2095
Public health, 999
Seed grain purchases, 1188, 4677
Technical education, 1246
Telegraph and telephone lines, 5397
Western farmers, relief for, 3478, 4677
White pine blister rust, 4677
Business Profits War Tax Act, administration of, 3655, 3676, 5290
See also Taxation
Business Profits War Tax Act Amendment Bill. Res., 1436, 1445. 1r., 1774. 2r., 2107. Com., 2107. Rep., 2108. 3r., 2139
See also Taxation
Butter. *See* Agriculture
Cables. *See* Telegraphs
Campbell, Mr. Duncan J., position of, 758
Campbell, Capt. G. H., employment of, 4508
Campbellton-Gaspe steamship service, 1126, 1228, 1959
Canada Evidence Act Amendment Bill. 1r., 4291. 2r., 4463. Com., 4463. 3r., 4466
Canada Gazette, publication of, 3737
Canada Grain Act, expenses under, 5205
Canada Grain Act Amendment Bill. 1r., 386
Canada Temperance Act
Expenses under, 5243
New Brunswick, proposed repeal, 1263, 3739
Canada Year Book, 2337.
Canadian Army Medical Service
Babtie, Dr.
Inquiry and report, 201, 227, 522, 559, 669, 4195
Reply to by Dr. Bruce, 4954
Bruce, Dr.
Report, 201, 227, 527, 559, 601, 669, 1343, 1720, 1864, 3962, 4194.
Publication of, 3845
Reply to Dr. Babtie report, 4954
Carleton-Jones, Surgeon General, report of, 1866
Changes in, 4466
Treatment of soldiers, 3963
See also Hospitals
Canadian Associated Press, 5290
Canadian Association of Returned Soldiers, 4951
Canadian Aviation Fund, 5362
Canadian Bank of Commerce, shareholders and investments of, 4686
Canadian General Council of the Boy Scouts Association, grant to, 3740
Canadian Government Railways
Branch lines, 2223, 2228
Cars
Freight, 2205
Intercolonial, on, 1378, 2226, 3395
Private, 4933
Purchase of, 758, 1376, 1866, 4298
Refrigerator, 4933
Coal for, 3388
Purchase of, 592, 664, 667
Construction and betterment, 3385
Employees
Pay of enlisted, 595
Promotion of, 759
Freight handlers at Pictou, 303
Employees' magazine, 452
Halifax terminals, 2204
Hudson Bay railway, 3396, 5086
Ice, tenders for, 301
Intercolonial
Accidents, 1376
Boisdale, contracts for work at, 4415
Cars, 2226
Shortage of, 1378
Purchases, 3395
Coal, freight rates on, 3511, 4292
Construction and betterment—details of items, 2224
Crossings, 2222
Damage claims, 2707, 3416
Earnings, 2202
Grades, improvement of, 456
Grand Narrows bridge, 2321

Canadian Government Railways—*Con.*
Levis station, 2208
Maritime Express service, 8
Milford ballast pit, 2320
Obstructions, removal of, 1376
Operation of, 759
Passenger service, 2203
Peniac bridge, 2320
Pension fund, 1476
Rails, 1575
Rates, coal, on, 4292
Station accommodation, 2227
Stations, naming of, 3386
Tracadie siding, 2618
See also Government Railways Act Amendment Bill.
Intoxicating liquors, shipment on, 591
Level crossing, Pictou harbour branch, 304
Line improvements, 2204
Military and hospital trains, 2205
National Transcontinental
Earnings, 2203
Engineers' residence at Fitzpatrick, 455, 456
Express service, 595
Fitzpatrick yard, 455
Freight rates, 2210, 3394
Operation, 657, 1573, 3411.
Expenses of, 2203
Portneuf claims, 1571
Rails, removal of to France, 1229, 1266, 2225
St. Malo shops, 1128
Salmon river viaduct, 2212
Solicitor's fees, 454
Telegraph line, 456
Ties, purchases of, 455
Traffic, 2209, 2218
Obstructions, removal of, 595
Officials, 657, 3390
Operation of, 2203, 3386
Passenger service, 2207
Prince Edward Island
Car ferry and terminals, 2205
Widening of, 3902, 3945
Quebec railways, 4948, 5452
Rails, 2224
Rolling stock, 594, 4928. *See, under this title,* Cars
Safety-first inspectors, 337
Ships, building of, for, 4939, 5429
Valley railway, 1380
Working expenses, 3410
See also Government Railways Act Amendment Bill

Canadian Northern Railway.
British Columbia, lines and works aided by province of, 4987

Canadian Northern Railway—*Con.*
Capital stock of affiliated companies held by, 4626
Payments on interest account, 4338
Removal of rails from, 301, 3398
Canadian Northern Railway Company.
Financial statements respecting, 4058
Report of Drayton-Acworth Commission, 4011
Canadian Northern Railway Acquisition Bill.
Res., 4022, 4215, 4217, 4247. 1r., 4293. 2r., 4467, 4512, 4566. Com., 4590, 4622, 4835, 4960, 5015. 3r., 5108, 5123-5194
Amendment proposed: Mr. Graham, 4477; lost on div., 4590
Closure applied, 5002, 5015, 5121, 5123
Canadian Pacific Railway. *See* British Government
Canadian Patriotic Fund, 595, 3078
Allowances from, 203, 207, 383, 3951
See also War Charities
Canadian Press Limited, 3740
Canals, 3402, 3417
For individual canals, see their titles
Canteen. *See* Army
Cape Bold breakwater, 3873
Cape Breton
Recruiting officers, 5361
Senate representation, 89
Cape Cove pier, 3879
Capital Punishment,
Plebiscite proposed, 1016
Russia's abolition of; proposed congratulations, 1012
Spain case, 1018
Women and children, in cases of, 1017, 1150
See Criminal Code Amendment Bills
Caraquet and South Shore Railway, 2223, 3387

Cardin, Mr. P. J. A. (Richelieu)
Canadian Northern Railway, acquisition of, 5175
Military Service Bill, 3058
St. Lawrence Flour Mills Company, 4509
Carleton beach protection works, 1128

Caron, Mr. Hector, employment of, 4151

Carrier, Emile, allowance to, 581

Carroll, Mr. William F. (South Cape Breton)
Aeroplane service, 1331
Army Recruiting Officers, Cape Breton, 5361
Budget, 1424
Taxation of incomes, 1424
Government expenditure, 1425
So-called prosperity, 1426
Control of food prices, 1427

Carroll, Mr. W. F.—*Con.*
Reply to statements of Mr. Edwards, 1430
Canada Temperance Act, 5244
Canadian Government Railways, private cars, 4933
Canadian Northern Railway acquisition of, 5140
Censors and decoders, 576
Customs Department, motor boats, 3759
Dental officers, 1574
East Bay wharves, 5315, 5317
Flour, price of, 1044
Food products, prices and control of, 1427
Indians—Sydney reserve, 1888
Insurance, 5203
Macdonald, Miss Jessie, 5361
McNeil, Lt. John D., 5272
Military Service, 2854
Nova Scotia steamship service, 2291
Shipbuilding, 1331
Submarine situation, 1329
Taxation
Incomes, 1424
Wealth, 2859
Toronto, Hamilton and Buffalo Railway, 2613
Carroll, Lieut. W. F., M.P., position and pay of, 6066
Carson, Major General, position of, 986
Carvell, Mr. Frank B. (Carleton, N.B.)
Agricultural instruction, 3755
Army, soldiers
Pay of, on promotion, 5423
Voting of, 4795-4834, 4874-4887, 4889-4914
Bear river, N.S.
Indian agents, 1569
Wharfinger, 1378
British preference, 1711
Canada Gazette, 3738
Canada Temperance Act, 1263, 3739, 5243
Canadian Government Railways
Branch lines, 2230
National Transcontinental, Salmon river viaduct, 2212
Promotion of employees, 766
Quebec railways, 5464
Canadian Northern Railway, acquisition of, 4253, 4266, 5146
Companies, incorporation of, 5928-5942
Criminal Code amendments, jurors, 4301, 4318
Daylight saving, 3682
Desjardins, Lt. Col., 1818
Farm implements, duty on, 1708
Flour, price of, 1051
Georgian Bay Canal Commission, 989
Gordon divorce case, 5903
Carvell, Mr. F. B.—*Con.*
Government Railways Act amendment, 4340, 4356, 4366, 4863
Grain, fixing of price of, 3688
Hollocody, Captain, 897
House of Commons
Members, sessional indemnity of, 5790
Stenographers, 5789
Hudson Bay railway, 2230
Immigration agents, 1737, 1756
Indians,
New Brunswick, 1889
Reserves, cutting timber on, 1889
Insurance, 4388, 5202
Maritime Provinces, military affairs, 5226
McLeod-Tellier Commission, 5247, 5254
McNeil, F. C., payments to, 1380
Military district No. 6, 5226
Military service, 2709
Appeals, 3179
Referendum, 2711
Tribunals, 3152, 3161
O'Connor, Mr. W. F., report of, 3746, 3753
Parliament, railway transportation for members of, 3519
Potatoes, duty on, 5777
Proposed removal, 5274, 5982
Public works expenditure, 5348
Quarantine service, 3756
Quebec harbourmaster, 897
Railway employees, payment of salaries of, 5957, 5997
Railway Act, The, 3422-3453, 3516-3553, 3593, 3717
Ross rifle, 388, 412-434
Rural mail service, 3647
St. John harbour improvements, 5347
Soldiers, votes for, 1404
Sugar, colouring of, 1957
Surveys, 1346
Tariff revision, 1699
Taxation
Business profits, 1452, 4245
Income, 1452, 1701, 3768, 5884
Telegraph and telephone lines, 3543, 5363-5404, 5410
Unclaimed bank balances, 1007
Victoria breakwater, 1381
Valley railway, 1380
War Purchasing Commission inquiry *re* purchases, 340
War-time Elections Bill, 5660, 5676-5699, 5713
West Edmonton forest rangers and homestead inspectors, 1476
104th Regiment, 1570
Cattle. *See* Agriculture

Censorship, 3503, 3654, 3718, 2881, 3995, 4059, 5492
Censors and decoders, 576, 3718
Louisburg, at, 4008, 4048
See "The Fiddlers"

Census
Male population of Canada, 2283
Western, 2336

C. E. Tanner, steamer, 5362

Chabot, Mr. John L. (Ottawa)
Civil Service
Appointments, 2020
Salaries, 2251
Military service, 2781
Enlistment in Quebec, 2784

Chabot, Lt.-Col. J. L., M.P., position and pay of, 988

Chairman of Committees. *See* Deputy Speaker

Charitable and patriotic enterprises, organization and control of, 378, 462

Charlton, Mr. William A. (Norfolk)
Budget, 1304
Pulp and paper industry, 1304

Chicago drainage canal, 302

Chicoutimi, pure bred animals at, 4152

Chinese Immigration Act Amendment Bill. 1r., 843. 2r., com., 2139. Rep., 2149. 3r., 2285

Chisholm, Mr. A. W. (Inverness)
Economic and Development Commission, 2200
Fish and fisheries
Advisory Board, 2151
Dogfish, 2177
Inverness harbour, improvements, 5326
Margaree harbour improvements, 3867, 5330
National Service, provincial directors of, 2200
Nova Scotia public works, 5319, 5337
Scotch Hill post office, 3649
Steamship service, 2301, 2306
Telegraph and telephone lines, 5371

Cheese. *See* Agriculture: Dairy

Civil Service
Act, administration of, 1791
Appointments
Order in Council, Jan. 1917, under, 3003
Regulations governing, 643
Returned soldiers, 643
See also Army: Soldiers: Returned
Section 21, under, 607, 650, 693, 1023, 1351, 1937
Compulsory retirement from, alleged, 2059

Civil Service—*Con.*
Disfranchisement of civil servants, proposed, 2018
Dismissals, proposed, 3633
Employees, French-speaking, 2262, 2759
Employment of men in higher offices, 1256
Enlistments from, 192, 2014
Pay and separation allowances, 213, 663
Insurance, 3503
Mail carriers. See Post office
Promotions, 2010, 2011, 2238, 4666
Salaries, 1791, 2008, 2238, 2946
Enlisted men, of, 1353, 2014, 2252
Proposed increases, 583
See Civil Service Act Amendment Bill.
For departments see their titles

Civil Service Act Amendment Bill. Res., 2008. 1r., 2024. 2r., 2149. Com., 2238. 3r., 2285

Clark, Mr. Hugh (Parliamentary Under Secretary of State for External Affairs)
Mounted police, 4668

Clark, Mr. Michael (Red Deer)
Army, canteens, 811
Budget, 736
Problems arising from the war, 736
Necessity for economy, 737
Taxation of incomes, 738
Maintenance and extension of our foreign commerce, 739
Free trade, 740
Canadian Northern railway, acquisition of, 4867
Grain for breweries and distilleries, 1183
Military service, exemptions, 3367
Newspaper articles, correction of, 3617
Parliament, extension of term of, 3492
Political deadlock, rumoured, 1971
Referendum, 2665
Senate, appointments to, 934
Separation allowances, 1191
Soldiers, votes for, 1387
Taxation
Business profits, 737
Income, 738, 4639
Woman suffrage, 1518

Clarke, Mr. W. A. (North Wellington)
Military Service Bill, 2861

Clergy as immigration agents, 5361

Clements, Mr. H. S. (Comox-Atlin)
Wharves, construction of, 5318

Cloakey, George, employment of, 1819

Closure. *See* Speaker, Parliamentary Procedure; Canadian Northern Railway Acquisition Bill

Coal. *See* Mines

Coal miners' strikes. *See* Mines

Coalition government, 2463, 2887, 2901, 3000, 3014, 3023, 3727, 3732
Political deadlock rumoured, 1941
See National government
Correspondence between Sir Robert Borden and Sir Wilfrid Laurier, 2692

Cochrane, Hon. Frank (Minister of Railways and Canals)
Canadian Government railways
Cars, purchase of, 4928
Coal purchases, 664, 667
Freight rates, 3394
Hudson Bay railway, 5087
Intercolonial
Cars, 2227
Construction and betterments, 2224
Management and operation, 775
Officials, appointment of, 658
Passenger service, 2203
Line improvements, 2204
Military and hospital trains, 2205
Rails, 2224
National Transcontinental
Freight rates, 2210
Operation, 658
Salmon River viaduct, 2217
Operating expenses, 2203
Prince Edward Island railway terminals and car ferry, 2205
Canals
St. Peter's, 3406
Trent, 2206, 3405
Welland, 2206
Coal
Confiscation of by railways, 584
Shortage, 83
Prices, 666
Government Railways Act Amendment Bill, 3845, 4339, 4365, 4386
Provincial legislators, free transportation for, 684
Quebec railways, 5472
Railway Act, the, 194, 602, 605, 3421, 3511-3553, 3592-3608, 3716
Railway, situation, inquiry into, 3408
Railways—France, removal of materials to, 311, 1825, 3407
Railways and Canals Department estimates, 657, 2202, 3385, 4925, 4928, 5428
St. John and Quebec Railway Act Amendment Bill, 2433, 3401

Cockshutt, Mr. William F. (Brantford)
Address in reply to the Governor General's Speech, 100
The war, 100

Cockshutt, Mr. W. F.—*Con.*
Camp Borden, 101
Recruiting, 101
France and the war, 102
President Wilson's peace proposals, 103
Control of foodstuffs, 106
Canada's trade, 108
Army; officers, reversion to ranks of, 4000
Bell Telephone Memorial Association, 5780
Flour, price of, 1065
Military service, 2599, 3233
Labour, 2604
Recruiting, 101
Soldiers' pay, 2603
Taxation
Income, 4077, 4080, 4092

Cold Storage,
Plants
Effect of, upon cost of living, 2027
Government control of, 1628
Proposed nationalization of, 2076
Subsidies for, 2076, 2255, 3744
Lockport Cold Storage Company, 2202

Commerce, Canadian Bank of, 4686

Committees. *See* House of Commons

Companies Act Amendment Bills,
Corporations for other purposes than gain, (No. 129, Sir Thomas White) 1r., 5242
General (No. 132, Sir Thomas White), 1r., 5880; 2r., 5918; com., 5918; 3r., 5953
Uniformity (No. 43, Mr. A. K. Maclean), 1r., 843; 2r., 1151

Compulsory military service,
See Army *and* Military Service Bill

Contract Prices, Bill to prohibit,
See Criminal code amendment

Confederation, fiftieth anniversary celebration, 11, 16, 24, 38, 47, 150, 161, 175, 524
Committee
Apointed 587
Joint action with Senate, 642
Report, made, 1865; adopted, 2283

Connaught, The late Duchess of
Expressions of sympathy on death of, 609

Conscription
Manhood, of, 14, 54, 191, 893, 1586. *See* Military service
Blondin, Hon. P. E., alleged statement of, 339
Wealth. *See* Taxation

Conservation
Commission, salaries, etc., 3744, 5793
Forestry—poplar trees. 3742

Copp, Mr. A. B. (Westmorland)
Address in reply to the Governor General's speech, 160

Copp, Mr. A. B.—*Con.*
Recruiting among the French Canadians, 160
The fiftieth anniversary of Confederation, 161
National government, 161
Political patronage, 162
Extravagance of present administration, 163
The ex-Minister of Militia, 164
National service, 170
Westmorland county and war profits, 171
Extension of term of Parliament, 172
The Dorchester election, 173
Alleged statement of Mr. Blondin, 173
Budget, 1307
Speech of Sir Sam Hughes, 1307
Winning of the war, 1310
Charges of extravagance against the Government, 1310
High cost of living, 1313
Revenue and expenditure, 1314
Taxation proposals, 1315
Intercolonial railway, operation of, 1316
Canadian Government Railways
Construction and betterment, 3387
Intercolonial
Grand Narrows bridge, 2321
Management and operation, 773
Milford ballast pit, 2320
Peniac bridge, 2320
Government Railways Act Amendment, 4363
Canadian Northern Railway, acquisition of, 5143
Cape Bald breakwater, 3873
Cost of living, 2005
Customs duties payable by provincial governments, 2135
Dorchester county election, 173
Fisheries officers, 2164
Food products, price and control of, 1313
Government Railways Act Amendment, 4363
Indians, 1892
Inland Revenue Department estimates, 3843
Labour problems, 1173
Migratory birds, 3658
Military Service, 3075
Moncton armoury site, 4787
National service, 170
National Transcontinental Railway, removal of rails, 2225
Patriotic Fund, 3077
Pensions, 6031

Copp, Mr. A. B.—*Con.*
Proportional representation, 917
Railway Act, The, 3442
Sackville wharves, 3878
Soldiers, votes for, 1401, 4703
Taxation, 1315
Telegraph and telephone lines, 5382
War-time Elections Bill, 5610
Wilfrid C., boat, 4062

Cost of living
See O'Connor, Mr. W. F., K.C., *also* Cold storage

Council of Indian Tribes of Canada Incorporation Bill, 1r., 3902

Courcelette, steamer, 1377

Court, Pte. Harry Ivan, request for discharge of, 3295

Courts, *See* Justice

Coutts quarantine reserve, 590

Cox, John, position of, 1472

Criminal Code Amendment Bills
Alien enemies prohibited from voting (No. 59, Mr. Currie), 1r., 1862
Capital punishment, abolition of, (No. 3, Mr. Bickerdike), 1r., 46; 2r., moved, 325, negatived, 1028-1036
See Capital Punishment
Contract prices, prohibition of, (No. 21, Mr. Knowles), 1r., 386; 2r., moved, 1617; debate adjourned, 1627
Insurance (No. 54, Mr. Doherty), 1r., 1773; 2r., 2104; com., 4388; 3r., 4395
Jurors, (No. 97, Mr. Doherty), 1r., 2567; 2r., 4293; com., 4318; 3r., 4383. Six months' hoist, moved by Mr. Lemieux, negatived, 4307
Non-support; foster parents; bawdy houses; insolvent traders; constables' fees, (No. 124, Mr. Doherty), 1r., 4291; 2r., 4463; com., 4463; 3r., 4466
Racing meets, limitation of, (No. 2, Mr. Wilcox), 1r., 8; 2r., 313-324

Cromwell, Mr. F. R. (Compton)
Live stock purchases, 2279
Railway Act, The, 3604

Cross point wharf, 988, 1228, 1571

Crothers, Hon. T. W. (Minister of Labour)
Army
Camps, sale of liquor in, 831
Soldiers, voting of, 4702
Assistant Deputy Minister of Labour, abolition of office of, 686
Budget, 1267
The extravagant waste of time in the House, 1267

Crothers, Hon. T. W.—*Con.*
Administration of Labour Department, 1269
The labour situation, 1270
The coal situation, 1275
Food prices, 1273
Coal
Questionnaire concerning, 1996
Sale, regulation of, 1275
Western mining of, 159, 614, 1266, 1372, 1616, 2295, 2570, 2653, 2776
Food
Control of sales and prices, 1273, 1989, 2083
Flour, price of, 1043
High cost of living, 695
Industrial Dicputes Investigation Act, 1112, 1168, 1270
Labour Department
Administration of, 1269
Estimates, 686, 1112, 1166, 1989, 3652
Landry, Mr. Justice, findings of, 5248
Le Canada, correction of statement in, 2571
Military Service, 2483
Referendum, 2487
O'Connor, Mr. W. F., K.C., inquiry and report by, 3652, 3925
Strikes, prevention of, 1270
Technical education, 1236
Thetford mines labour trouble, 1118
War-time Elections Bill, 5867
Yukon, cost of living in, 2199, 2481, 2525

Cruise, Mr. Robert (Dauphin)
Budget, 1432
Taxation of profits, 1432
Government expenditure, 1434
Free wheat, 1435
Proposed Highways Bill, 1435
Manitoba boundaries extension, 1435
Campbell, Duncan J., 758
Chabot, Lt.-Col., 988
Free wheat, 1435
Glen, Col. Joseph, payments to, 1377
Railway Act, The, 3520, 3550
Railway transportation for members of Parliament, 3520
Smith's Falls postmaster, 1570
Taxation of business profits, 1432

Cunningham, Frances Henry, payments to, 1125

Currie, Mr. John A. (North Simcoe)
Aliens, 3810, 3812
Austro-Germans in western provinces, 1265
Bill to prohibit voting by alien enemies, 1862

Currie, Mr. J. A.—*Con.*
Army
Recruiting, 3372
Officers, military pay of, 1676
See, under this head, Soldiers
Army and Navy veterans, 5912
Civil Service appointment, 2019
Coal, 2001
Companies, incorporation of, 5926, 5928
Criminal Code amendments, Jurors, 4299
Dominion Lands Act Amendment, 3801, 3805-3817
France, trade relations with, 2310, 2316
Gordon Divorce Bill, 5498, 5905
Grand Trunk Pacific Railway Company Branch Lines Company, 1375
Imperial Preference, 1584
Loans to farmers, 1965
Martell, Lt. L. A., 5914
Military Service
Classes, 3293, 3356
Exemptions, 3221, 3228, 3279, 3304, 3367
General provisions, 3243, 3252
Great Britain, in, 2908
Regulations, 3316
Reinforcements, need of, 2904, 2915
Selective draft, 2916
O'Connor, Mr. W. F., report of, 3752
Packages, marking of—inspection and sale,—4069
Parliament, printing of, 5949, 5950
Pensions, 6008
Railway Act, The, 3548
Rifles, importations of, 1125
Rural mail carriers, 3643
Shipbuilding, 1584, 5449
Soldiers,
Parcels for, 3644
Returned, 1586
Votes for, 4775, 4832
Widows of, 3805
Stayner public building, 5412
Taxation, proposals of the Government, 2912
Telegraphs and telephones, 3548
War
Canada's part in the, 2906
Prosecution of, 1576
War-time Elections Bill, 5762, 5845

Currie, Col. J. A., M.P., military position and pay of, 595

Currie, General, despatch from, 4510

Customs
Bonded goods, shipments of, 1854
Department
Appointments of returned soldiers, 1850, 1858, 1884

Customs—*Con.*
Dismissals, 1844
Estimates, 643, 1843, 1881, 5098, 5777
Motor boats in use by, 3759
Motor car of, 1476
North Sydney officials, 1852
Staff and salaries, 643, 1843, 5908, 5777
See also Civil Service
Drawbacks, payments of, 1818
Forms, printing of in French and English, 3133, 3134
Minister of, private car for, 5082
Preventive service, 1881
Revenue cruisers, 1881
Unclaimed goods, disposal of, 3743

Customs Act Amendment Bill
Duties payable on Crown's goods. Res., 1978. 1r., 1985. 2r., 2119. Com., 2121. Rep., 2136. 3r., 2137

Customs Tariff,
Alcohol, proposed free admission for hospital use, 5103
Apples, 1472, 1615
Bags and sacks, 1867
Beans for seed, 671
Bran and middlings, 1867
British preference, proposed increase, 1776
Crown, goods of the, dutiable. *See* Customs Act Amendment Bill
Farm implements, 1686, 1708
Fertilizer, 1709
Food, proposed additions to the free list, 1776-1790
Gasolene, 1675
Hospital supplies, 5103
Imperial Munitions Board imports, 1978
Provincial governments, duties payable by, *See* Customs Act Amendment Bills

Dagneau, John F., position of, 1471

Dairying. *See* Agriculture

Dalhousie, N.B., militia buildings, 454

Danis, Joseph Maximilian, employment of, 2618

Davidson, Mr. Avard L. (Annapolis)
Army, soldiers, voting of, 4709, 4712, 4772
Carroll, Lieut. W. F., M.P., 6066
Douglas, Captain J. M., M.P., 6066
Ellis, Captain J. F., M.P.P., 6066
Neely, Captain D. B., M.P., 6066
Nova Scotia public works, 5320
Ralston, Major J. L., M.P.P., 6067
Schaffner, Mr. L. P., dismissal of, 441
Taxation, income, 4136
Telegraph and telephone lines, 5376
War-time Elections Bill, 5733, 5737

Davidson, Hon. Sir Charles, Kt., Commissioner
Payments to, 898
Report of, 249, 524

Davies Company. *See* Food: Investigation

Dawson post office, 4952, 5313

Daylight Saving Bill. 1r., 2956; 2r., 2945, 3677; com., progress reported, 3687

Dean, Lieutenant R. I., position of, 5703

Decoders. *See* Censors

"Defeat or Victory," book, question as to prohibition of, 1473

Defence of Canada. *See* Militia and Defence

Delisle, Mr. Michel S. (Portneuf)
Chicoutimi, pure bred animals at, 4152
Desertions from army, 338
Dillon, Mr. G. A., 4061
Dorchester County Railway, 5361
Fiset, Theophile, 1959
Gazelle, Noel, enlistment of, 337
Grenier, Mr. Armand, 3757
Lacasse, Mr. Isidore, 5272
Lewis, Mr. J. H., 2944
Military Service Bill, 3064
Transcontinental railway, Portneuf claims, 1571
157th Battalion, 5272

Demers, Mr. M. Joseph (St. John and Iberville)
Auditor General's report, 1469
Canadian Northern Railway acquisition of, 5078
Military Service Bill, 2561
Authority of Parliament, 2561
Motives of the Government, 2563
Referendum proposals, 2567

Deputy Speaker and Chairman of Committees (Mr. J. H. Rainville)
Address to Mr. Viviani, 1361
Election of, 334
Rulings and statements of
Bills—Sections allowed to stand not discussable, 4752
Censored publications, quotations in Parliament from, 5493
Irrelevancy, 2362, 2374, 5235, 5237
Money vote, how amendable, 521
Ways and means, second amendment to motion for, 1319

Descarries, Mr. Joseph A. (Jacques Cartier)
Address in reply to the Governor General's speech, 12
Tributes to deceased members, 13
The Allies' part in the war, 14
Conscription, 14

Descarries, Mr. J. A.—*Con.*
Imperial War Conference, 15
Expiration of term of Parliament, 15
Progressive policies of present administration, 16
Fiftieth anniversary of Confederation, 16
Military Service Bill, 2982
Appeals, 3184
Burden of proof, 3323
Tribunals, 3172
Railway Act, The, 3441, 3444

Desjardins, Lt.-Col., employment of, 1818

Devlin, Mr. Emmanuel B. (Wright)
Address in reply to the Governor General's Speech, 244, 249
National unity and harmony, 244
Recruiting figures, 245
Quebec and the war, 247
Patriotic policy of Liberal party, 248
Statements of Hon. Mr. Blondin, 250
Attitude of the Government, 250
Blondin, Hon. Mr., alleged statements of, 250
Burgess, defalcation of, 1127
Canadian Expeditionary Force, 1576
Canadian Northern railway, 4863
Civil Service
Disfranchisement of civil servants, 2021
Salaries, 1038, 2010
Grain for breweries and distilleries, 1176
Judges' salaries, 5797
Military Service Bill, 2731
Authority under Militia Act, 2732
Contraventions of Act, 3332
Persons liable for service, 3129
Quebec province, position of, 2736
Referendum proposals, 2736
Tribunals, 3153
Milsom, Major J. C., 1265
Recruiting, 245
Folkstone director of, 1226
Spittal, Lt.-Col. C. D., 1127
War loan bonds, 2774
War taxation, use of funds obtained from, 4147

DeWolfe, Fred. T., position of, 5703

Digby,
Government lands, 2321
Indian lands, 304

Dillon, Major G. A., appointment of, 1958, 4061

Distilleries. *See* Grain *and* Alcohol

Divorce, Committee to revise rules governing, 4192, 4291
See Gordon Divorce Bill

Dodge, L. B., payments to, 306

Doherty, Hon. C. J. (Minister of Justice)
Béland, Hon. Dr. H. S., M.P., 524
Capital punishment, abolition of
Proposed plebiscite, 1017
Spain case, the, 1021
Coalition government, 3023
Companies Act Amendment, Bills, 1155
Criminal Code amendments
Insurance, 1773, 2104, 4388
Jurors, 2567, 4293, 4307
Non-support, foster parents, bawdy houses, insolvent traders, constables' fees, 4291, 4463
Customs, Crown's goods, 1983, 2119
Davidson Commission report, 524
Exchequer Court expenses, 1811
Government Railways Act amendment, 4368
Interest Act Amendment Bill, 2569, 3401
Judges
Appointment of, 1807
Salaries. *See* Judges Act Amendment Bill
Saskatchewan and Ontario, 1973
Yukon, 5896
Judges Act amendment, 2137, 5954, 6062
Justice Department, estimates, 1805, 5896, 6033
Kelly, Thomas, 1813, 4926, 5794
McLeod-Tellier Commission, 2357, 4291
Military service, 3016
Appeals and appeal tribunals, 3184, 3301
Authority of Parliament, 3031
Burden of proof, 3320
Classes, division into, 3353, 3359
Contraventions of Act, 3326, 3351
Enforcement, 3264
Exceptions and exemptions, 3303, 3307, 3568
Referendum proposals, 3028
Tribunals, 3153, 3168, 3296, 4193, 5881
Military Voters' Bill, 4406, 4688, 4742, 4792, 4874, 4889, 5956
Pelagic Sealing Treaty, claims under, 5977
Penitentiaries
Kelly, Thomas, treatment of, 1813, 4926, 5794
Officials' salaries, 6039
Prisoners, proposed enlistment of, 1013, 1814
Pensions, 6039
Post Office Department, estimates, 2352, 2360, 3634, 6051
Prices, contract fixing of, 1624
Provincial legislatures, powers of, 1808
Provincial prohibitory legislation, Bill in aid of, 4192, 4395, 5514
Woman suffrage, 1491

Doherty, Hon. C. J., payments to, 898

Dominion Canners Company, 1105, 1289

Dominion Day; fiftieth anniversary. *See* Confederation

Dominion Lands Act Amendment Bills
General (No. 107, Mr. Roche), 1r., 2832. 2r., 3793. Com., 3793
Patents (No. 12, Mr. McCraney), 1r., 159. Withdrawn, 1157

Dominion Lands and Parks
Animals in, 1359
Estimates, 1344, 4917
Forest reserves, 1349
Officials, 1675
See Parks

Dominions, overseas, constitutional relations of, 1528, 1531

Dominions Royal Commission, 599, 2338

Donaldson, Mr. Samuel J. (Prince Albert)
Army camps, sale of liquor in, 816

Dorchester county election, 92. 111, 120, 146, 173, 208, 255, 293

Dorchester County Railway, 5361

Dorchester, N.B.
Penitentiary. *See* Penitentiaries
Wharf, 3874

Douglas, Mr. James M. (Strathcona)
Apples, duty on, 1472, 1715
Army, forestry battalions, 3950
Dominion Lands Act amendment, 3805
Flour, price of, 5211
Gasolene, duty on, 1675
Grain
Elevators, 3705
Wheat, fixing of price of, 3705
Military Service Bill, 3051
Patriotic Fund allowances, 3952
Tariff revision, 1714
War-time Elections Bill, 5604

Douglas, Captain J. M., position of, 6066

Drake, steamship, duty on cargo of, 4245

Dredging. *See* Public Works

Dropped order. *See* Parliamentary Procedure

Drummond, T. J., steamer, 669, 4925, 4939

Dry Dock Subsidies Act Amendment Bill. Res., 4455. 1r., 5771. 2r., 5887. Com., 5915. 3r., 5918

Dubreuil, Mr., dismissal of, 3635

Dussault, Mr. Albert, employment of, 457

Dynamite outrages
Arrests in Montreal, 5423
Atholstan, Lord, 5423
Bigras, Gedéon, 5360

East Bay wharves, 5315

Eaton, Ernest, enlistment of, 3419

Economic and Development Commission, 1125, 2200, 5792

Edmonton, enlistments, 336. 3373

Edmonton, Dunvegan and British Columbia Railway, subsidy to, 4925

Edson, Alta., population of, 1816

Edward VII, monument to His late Majesty, 3897

Edwards, Mr. J. W. (Frontenac)
Address in reply to the Governor General's Speech, 204
The war, 204
Political patronage in purchase of war supplies, 205
Patriotic Fund separation allowances, 207
Military appointments, 207
Maritime Province elections, 207
The Dorchester compaign, 208
Recruiting in Quebec. 213, 221
Statements of the leader of the Opposition, 218, 220
Naval policy of Liberal party, 219
Extension of term of Parliament—votes for soldiers, 223
National ideals, 224
Bran and shorts, duty on, 1875
Budget, 1209
The record of the Liberal party, 1209
Canada's trade, 1211
Free wheat, 1212
Vessels for carrying flour, 1213
Free trade, 1214
Scarcity of food, 1216
Improvement of highways, 1217
The leader of the Opposition, 1219
Proposed general election, 1220
Cattle, British embargo on, 922
Censorship, 5943
Dorchester county election, 208
Experimental farms, 2055
Food, scarcity of, 712, 1216
Free wheat, 1212
Gordon Divorce Bill, 5500
High cost of living, 712, 1216
Highways, improvement of, 1217
Home defence recruiting officers, 3134
Horses, glandered, 2056
House of Commons stenographers, 5789
Immigration agents, 4914, 5361
Judges' salaries, 5799. *See, under this head,* Supreme Court
Lavergne, Mr. Armand, 2619
Mail clerks, French-speaking, 5272
Military districts Nos. 3 and 10, 455
Military service, 2715, 3221
National service cards, 667, 713

Edwards, Mr. J. W.—*Con.*
Parcel post service, 3634
Parliamentary secretaryships, 4211, 4214
Party records, 2373
Patriotic Fund, 207, 595, 3951
Penitentiaries
Portsmouth, 3418
Report of inspector of, 3419
Salaries of officials, 6033
Pensions, 6012
Post office signs—language in which written, 5999
Potatoes, 5987
Pugsley, Lieut. J. A., 4895
Quebec and military service, 2719-2728
Recruiting, 213, 221, 569
Rural mail routes, 1959
Shipbuilding, 1213, 1670
Soldiers
Pay and pensions of, 3216, 6012
Voting of, 223, 4807, 4895
Storage elevators, 2099
Supreme Court—allowance to Chief Justice, 6049
Taxation of wealth, 2728
Unclaimed bank balances, 1010
Votes for soldiers, 223, 4807
War-time Elections Bill. 5570, 5678, 5742, 5873

Eggs, imports and exports of, 1573

Elaine, steamer, 1379

Elevators. *See* Grain.

Ellis, Captain J. F., position and pay of, 6066

Elrose, Sask., mail service, 899.

Elliot, Mr. George A. (North Middlesex)
Soldiers, votes for, 1387

Emigration
Restrictions on Canadians of military age, 1726, 1775
United States, to, 987, 3285
See also Immigration

Esquimalt dock yards, 5915

Estevan, Canadian Government Steamship, purchase of provisions for, 4923

Estimates. *See titles of Departments and subjects*

Ethier, Mr. J. A. C. (Two Mountains)
Canadian Northern Railway, acquisition of, 5019, 5112
Food requirements, 2869
Military service, 2863
Labour, attitude of, 2871
St. Jerome post office, 899
War-time Elections Bill, 5826

Exchequer Court. *See* Supreme Court, etc., Bill

Exchequer Court Act Amendment Bill. 1r., 1422.

Excise. *See* Inland Revenue

Expeditionary force. *See* Army

Experimental farms. *See* Agriculture.

Faguy, Gaudiose. dismissal of, 2284

False Creek dredging, 900, 1126

Farm labour. *See* Labour

Farmers
Employment of soldiers by, 1677
Loans to. *See* Bank Act Amendment Bill
Western, relief for. *See* Grain

Farmers Bank
Depositors, proposed reimbursement of, 4508
Shareholders of, 301

Farming industry, development of, 1776, 1786. *See also* Agriculture

Fiddlers *See* "The Fiddlers"

Finance
Debt of Canada, 347
Department
Estimates, 578, 1790, 6289
Staff and salaries, 1796, 5289
Gold, handling of, 1796
Income and expenditure of Canada, 274, 718, 723, 745, 846
Interest. *See* Interest Act Amendment Bill
Loans
Dominion, $100,000,000
Cost of issue, 342, 435, 4957
Proceeds from, 4416, 4621. *See* Public Service Loan Bill
Farmers, to. *See* Bank Act Amendment Bills
Grand Trunk Pacific Railway, 5292
Quebec harbour. *See that title*

Fiset, Theophile, payments to, 1959

Fish and fisheries
Advisory Board, 2151
Bait, 2036
Bounties to fishermen, 457
Canneries
Licenses for operation of, 3399
See Meat and Canned Foods Act Amendment Bill *and* Fisheries Act Amendment Bill
Committee on supply of, 3400
Department
Appointments, 2149
Estimates, 2149
Development of industry, 2037
Dogfish, 2176
Exhibit at Toronto, 2033
Export of, 454
Herring, 2036

Fish and Fisheries—*Con.*
Inspection, 2035
Inspector Fisher, 2170
Investigation of problems, 5288
Laws, violation of, 2389
Licenses, 2051, 2182
Lobsters, 2049, 2117, 2154, 4171, 5425
Marketing, 2037, 2042
Ministry of, proposed, 2026
Officers, 2151, 2157, 2161
Oysters, 2174
Patrol service, 2183
Protection service, 4163, 4166, 4170
Salt for curing purposes, 1027, 1319, 1373, 2044, 2290, 3556
Sardine fisheries, 4168
Telephone method of fishing, 2176
Transportation, 2031, 2042, 3392, 3556, 4933
Trawlers, steam, 300
Whitefish, 2159

Fisheries Act Amendment Bill. Res, 2116. 1r., 2118. 2r., 2149. Ref, to Com., 2149. Com., 3399. 3r., 3400

Fisher, Mr. John H. (Brant)
Recruiting in Paris and Burford, 601
Soldiers, votes for, 1386

Flags on public buildings, 4146

Flavelle, Sir Joseph, letter from, 2956, 4010
See O'Connor *and* Food

Flax industry, 4683

Flour. *See* Grain

Food
Adulteration of, 2387
Bacon and lard, 3915, 5274
Beef, exports and imports of, 1574
Butter. *See* Agriculture
Cheese. *See* Agriculture
Control of, 108, 695, 1304, 1313, 1427, 1989, 2076, 2471, 2509, 2580, 3045, 3744
Australia, in, 963
Prices, 3918
Sugar, 1992
Controller
Appointment, 2433
Office and assistants, 3502, 4413, 4414, 4244
Powers of, 3943
See also Food Products
Eggs, exports and imports of, 1573
Fish, committee on supply of, 3400
Flour, 700, 1868, 5207
Prices and profits, 1039, 1088, 5085
Yukon, in, 2237
See also Grain.
Imports and exports of, 1573
Inspectors, 607

Food—*Con.*
Investigations of Mr O'Connor:
Report of, 3652, 3914; inquiry into, 3914, 3744, 4243
Maple sugar and syrup, 1958
Order in Council *re* sale of, 1273
Packages and containers of, 4065, 4070
Potatoes, 702, 2095. *See* Agriculture
Prices and supply of
Flour, 700
Sugar, 695
See, under this title, Control *and* Controller
Scarcity of, 1216
Sugar, 695, 1957
Supply of, arrangements with British Government, 2260
See also Meat and Canned Foods Act Amendment Bill; Grain; Inspection and Sale Act Amendment Bill

Forestry
Poplar, conservation of, 3742
Timber, protection of, 1349
White pine, blister rust, 4677

Fortier, Mr. Edmond (Lotbinière)
Burke, Col. Rev. A. E., 5704
Customs, private car for Minister of, 5082
McLeod-Tellier Commission, 3418
Military service, 3067
Public Works Department,—automobile purchase, 2480

Foster, Mr. A. De Witt, government employ of, 303

Foster, Rt. Hon. Sir Gecrge E. (Minister of Trade and Commerce)
Balfour, Rt. Hon. A. J., visit to Canada and to House of Commons, 613
Board of Grain Supervisors for Canada, 2236, 3692
Boards of Trade Act, 3657
Canada Temperance Act, 1263
Canada Year Book, 2337
Civil Service—employment of men in higher offices, 1260
Coal, supply of, 4064, 4788
Confederation, fiftieth anniversary of, 1865
Connaught, the late Duchess of, 609
Daylight saving, 2356, 2945, 3677
Dominions Royal Commission, 599, 2338
France, trade relations with, 597, 2309
Fuel controller, appointment of, 2235
Grain
Breweries and distilleries, for, 1185
Congestion in the West, 340
Elevators, 2334, 3707, 3710, 3689
Prices, fixing of, 3689, 4564
Hay, inspection and grading of, 3402
Industrial and scientific research, 5276
Joffre, General—visit to Canada, 613

Foster, Rt. Hon. Sir G. E.—*Con.*
Military service, 2404
Oil bounties, 2329
Packages, marking of,—inspection and sale, 4065
Parliament
Extension of term of, 3461
Sessions of, expenses of, 1262
Pay and Records Office, 1355
Pensions, 6007
Railway Act, 3717
Referendum on military service, 2410
Research Council Bill, 2357, 3905, 3957
Salt for fish curing, 2290
Scientific and industrial research, 3905, 3957
Secretary of State Department estimates, 3737
Shipbuilding, 1337, 5436
Soldiers, returned, care of, 1590
Steamship service, 2285, 2323
Submarine situation, 1335
Technical education, 1244
Trade and Commerce
Commissioners and agents, 2326
Department estimates, 1835, 2285, 2323, 3687, 5205, 5275
United States
Declaration of war by, 610
Tariff, changes in, 1264
Viviani, M., address to, 1366
War
Charities, 5489
Prosecution of, 1588
Supplies—munitions contracts, 5529
War-time Elections Bill, 5853
Wealth, conscription of, 3462
Zinc bounties, 2330

Foster parents
See Criminal Code Amendment Bills

Fotheringham, Surgeon General J. T., report of, 4059

France
Exhibitions project with Canada, 2260
Food supplies for, 2310
Railway material for, 310, 335, 1229, 1266, 1372, 1473, 1474, 1615, 1628, 1690, 1820, 3407, 3409, 5293
Trade relations with, 597, 2307, 2309
Visit of Prime Minister to, 1536

Franchise
See War-time Elections Bill; Military Voters' Bill; Woman suffrage

Frank, Alta., moving of residences at, 4919

Fraser river channel improvements, 1126

Free wheat *See* Grain

Freight rates *See* Transportation

French Army manœuvres, attendance of Canadian officers at, 5219

French-Canadians
Enlistment of. *See* Quebec *and* Army
United States, in, 4914

French language
Bills, printing of in, 5550, 5559
Government officials speaking, 2262, 2265, 2340, 2759, 5272

Fripp, Mr. Alfred E. (Ottawa)
Civil Service
Disfranchisement of Civil servants, 2018
Promotions, 2018
Salaries, 2247

Fuel
Coal
Confiscation of by railways, 194, 334, 584
Mining
Director of operations, 2609, 2776
Government control, 1996
Western, 119, 169, 195, 341, 458, 523, 614, 1267, 1372, 1616, 1723, 1725, 2183, 2200, 2238, 2570, 2609, 2653, 2776, 3617, 4009, 4621
Ottawa prices, 1620
Pennsylvania, from, 2199
Prices and supply, 83, 665, 2092, 2292, 4621, 4788
Regulations *re* sale of, 1275, 2317
Transportation of, 1919, 3395, 4791
United States situation, 4788
Control, 1275, 2317
Controller
Appointment of, 2235
Assistant to, 4152
Staff of, 4245, 5422
Utilization of resources, coal, peat, oil shales, etc., 1405-1422
See also Mines and Minerals

Fullerton, Major T. F., employment of, 4508

Galt, Mr. Justice, report of, 599, 602, 2322, 2357; inquiry into, *see* McLeod-Tellier Commission

Game. *See* Northwest Game Bill

Gascons wharf, 2055

Gasolene. *See* Taxation

Gaspe steamship services, 2299, 2318, 2325

Gauthier, Mr. Louis J. (St. Hyacinthe)
Canadian Northern Railway, acquisition of, 5003, 5182
Language reflecting on the Chair withdrawn, 2609
Military service, 2551
Referendum, 2555
War-time Elections Bill, 5824

Gauvreau, Mr. Charles A. (Temiscouata)
Bartlett, Major, 5422
Currie, Col. J. A., M.P., position and pay of, 595
Currie, General, despatch from, 4510

Gauvreau, Mr. C. A.—*Con.*
Exchequer Court cases, 335
Government railways
Intercolonial, pension fund, 1476
Promotion of employees, 768
Jenkins, Lieut.-Col. S. R., 5422
Leigh, Major, 5422
L'Espérance, Hon. D. O., 4511
Lighthouse keepers' salaries, 3134
Louisville post office, 899
Military service, 2746
Exceptions, 3566
Recruiting in Quebec, 2748
Patent medicines, 335, 985, 1470
Riou, Mr. C S., 3904
Riviere du Loup, ferry service, 452
Seed grain for eastern Canada, 1150
Steamship service, Quebec, 2318
Temiscouata mail contract, 335
Thompson, Dr. Alfred, M.P., 5083

Gazelle, Noel, enlistment of, 337

Geological surveys, 4179

Georgian Bay Canal Commission, 452, 989, 3900, 5913

German, Mr. William M. (Welland)
Army
Equipment, 559
Medical service, 559, 3989
Officers, alleged surplus of, 560, 564
Recruiting, 560, 2631
Soldiers, voting of, 4701, 4718, 4818, 4893-4914
Canadian Northern Railway, acquisition of, 4026, 4254, 4869, 4960, 5049, 5189
Civil servants, compulsory retirement of, alleged, 2059
Grand Trunk Pacific Railway Branch Lines Company, 1375
High Commissionership, 4177
Loans to farmers, 1961
Military Service, 2630
Racing meets, limitation of, 322
Railways,
Government policy in regard to, 2219, 2221
Senate, proposed change in constitution of, 1131
Situation, inquiry into, 3408, 3414
Submarine warfare, 334
Taxation of income, 4072
Trent canal, 3405
War supplies,
Boots, 4062
Equipment generally, 559
Munitions, 5525
War-time Elections Bill, 5755
Welland canal, 3402
Woman suffage, 1508

Gerrie, Mr. Charles, appointment of, 4245

Gibson, Lieutenant William, position of, 5422

Girard, Mr. Joseph (Chicoutimi and Saguenay)
High cost of living, 2829
Military service, 2825, 3189, 3353
Recruiting, 2827
Riviere du Loup steamship service, 2358

Glass, Mr. S. Francis (East Middlesex)
Budget, 1432
Canadian Northern Railway, acquisition of, 4039
Cheese, inspection of, 2268
Cold storage, 2080
Daylight saving, 3685
Grain Supervisors, 3699
Insurance, 4389
Lord's Day Observance Act, 936
Military service, 1676, 3145, 3224, 3230, 3277
Straw, utilization of, 4683
Taxation of business profits, 1646
Technical education, 1249
Unclaimed bank balances, 1010
War charities, 5484, 5491, 6064
War-time Elections Bill, 5602, 5686, 5740
Wheat, fixing of price of, 3696

Glen, Colonel Joseph, payments to, 1377

Goldman, Mr. I., employment of, 4510

Government Railways
See Canadian Government Railways

Government Railways Act Amendment Bill, 1r., 3845. 2r., 4339. Com., 4339, 4365, 4863. 3r., 4417
Amendment, proposed: Mr. Boulay, ruled out, 4382: Mr. Hughes, 4385; lost on div., 4387

Graham, Hon. George P. (South Renfrew)
Agriculture, development of, 2578
Aiken, Mr. G. O., 4151, 4508
Army
Camps, sale of liquor in, 835
Officers
Reversion to ranks of, 3997
Wives of, passports for, 3997
Soldiers, voting of, 4793-4834
Athletic associations, 5922
Bennett, Mr. R. B., M.P., reply to statement of, 804, 869
Breidert and Mudge patents, 1200
Canada Gazette, publication of, 3737
Canadian Northern Railway, acquisition of, 4022, 4217, 4277, 4282, 4388, 4471, 4591, 4622, 4845, 5041, 5158
Capital punishment, 627, 1022
Charitable enterprises, organization and control over, 378, 5485
Chicago drainage canal, 302

Graham, Hon. G. P.—*Con.*
Civil Service
Appointments, 693, 2017
Employment of men in higher offices, 1259
Promotions, 2017
Companies Act amendment, 5922
Customs disposal of unclaimed goods, 3743
Defence of Canada, 359
Fisheries protection service, 4170
Food control, 2580
Gordon Divorce Bill, 5501
Government Railways
Cars, purchase of, 758, 1376
Promotion of employees, 770
Government Railways Act amendments, 4344, 4367
See under this head, Intercolonial; Transcontinental
Grain elevator facilities, 4188
Grain for breweries and distilleries, 1183
Grand Trunk Pacific Railway, loan to, 5299
Indians, British Columbia, 2340
Intercolonial, transfor of, alleged arrangements for,—denial, 804, 869
Judges, appointment of, 1807
McNab, Colin C., 578
Military buildings, inspector of, 1039
Military service
Classes, 3276
Contraventions of Act, 3225, 3349, 3580
Conscription of wealth, 2576
Enforcement, 3268
Exceptions, 3270, 3564, 3591
Exemptions, 3212, 3276
Industrial requirements, 2579
Insurance of war risks, 3557
Persons liable for service, 3128
Policies of leader of the Opposition, 2572
Quebec's attitude, 2572
Recruiting, 2573
Referendum proposal, 2582
Tribunals, 3160
Mines, Minister of, proposed, 2007
National Serivce Board
Expenses, 3676
Officers, 376
Noxious weeds, 2068
Overseas Military Forces, Minister of, 4431
Packages, marking—inspection and sale, 4068
Parliament buildings, construction of, 4182
Parliament, extension of term of, 3458
Pensions, 6024
Post Office Department estimates, 2352
Prisoners in penitentiaries, release of for farm work, 803

Graham, Hon. G. P.—*Con.*
Proportional representation, 911
Public works expenditure, 5343
Quebec and Saguenay Railway bondholders, 669
Railway Act, the, 605, 3420-3453, 3522
Railways—material for use in France, 335, 1833
Recruiting, 375, 568, 2573
Ross rifle, 482
Royal Military College, 5310
Senate, appointments to, 928
Soldiers
Cessation of working pay, 457
Returned, appointment of to government positions, 1850, 1858, 6054
Voting of, 4793, 4834
Taxation
Income, 1631, 3771, 4073, 4104
Land, 1629
Wealth, 2576, 3461
Telegraphs and telephones, 3545
Telephone lines, government, 5364, 5382
Trade and Commerce Commissioners, 2327
Transcontinental railway operations, 1573
War charities, 378, 5485
War, prosecution of the, 2320
War-time Elections Bill, 5589, 5674, 5686, 5693, 5729-5771, 5856
Wheat, free, 642
Grain and grain products
Bran and middlings, 1867, 4468
Breweries and distilleries for, 1176
Commission, Chairman of, 3711
Congestion of in the West, 340
Diseases—rust, 2063
Elevators, 986, 2099, 2334
Claims of employees, 386
Facilities, 4189
Operation of, 3705
Flour, sales of between Canada and United States, 5273
Freight rates on, 2210
Grading of, 1265
Middlings, duty on, 1867
Rust, 2063
Seed
Eastern Canada for, 1150, 1188
Payment for advances, 1126
Purchase of, 4677, 4916, 4924
Supervisors. *See* Board of Grain Supervisors
Transportation of, 1682, 3396, 3412, 3712
Wheat
Commission, 1381
Exportation of prohibited, 3882
Free, 729, 747-756, 850, 864-884, 889
Prices, fixing of, 3688, 4687, 4887, 4926, 5206, 5218, 6000

Grain and Grain products—*Con.*
Surplus, purchases of, 1126
Telegram from Non-Partisan League, on, 4512, 4564, 4661
United States tariff on, 1342

Grande Prairie immigration hall, 1575, 1817

Grand Trunk Pacific Branch Lines Company Bills
1. Bill No. 33 (Mr. Currie) 1r., 585; withdrawn, 667
2. Bill No. 41 (Mr. Currie) 1r., 843; 2r., 896; com., 1375; 3r., 1445

Grand Trunk Pacific Railway
Financial statements respecting, 4058
Loan to, 5292
Removal of rails from, 5293
Report of Drayton-Acworth Commission, 4011

Gravel, Lieut. Gedéon, 1674

Gravelle, Mr. Oscar, position of, 1226

Great Britain, military service in, 2908
See Army Act

Great War Veterans Association, 1574

Green, Mr. Robert F. (Kootenay)
Railway Act, The, 3514, 3542, 3545
Telegraphs, provisions governing, 3542

Grenier, Mr. Armand, employment of, 3757

Grey, Ambrose, employment of, 1818

Grilse, H.M.C.S., 4563

Grosse Isle quarantine station, 5306

Guthrie, Mr. Hugh (South Wellington)
Bags and sacks, duty on, 1873
Bran and shorts, 1874
Canadian Northern Railway, acquisition of, 5035
Coalition government, 2463
Enlistment, voluntary, 2454
Gordon Divorce Bill, 5502, 5903
Grain for breweries and distilleries, 1179
Military service, 2452
Personal, attitude respecting, 3721
Tribunals, 3300
Soldiers
Returned, care of, 470
Voting of, 4410
Tariff revision, 1780
Taxation
Income, 1783, 2453
Wealth, 2453
War-time Elections Bill, 5598
Windsor immigration officer, 2357

Guysborough public building, 5914

Gwatkin, General, administration of military affairs by, 4419

Halifax
Dry docks, 5915
Railway terminals, 2214

Halifax & Eastern Railway, contractors, 304

Hansard. *See* House of Commons

Hants county apple inspectors, 1380

Harbours. *See* Public works

Hardy, Lieut. M. R., employment of, 4509

Harris, Capt. R. V., position of, 5422

Hay, inspection and grading of, 3402
See Inspection and Sale Act Amendment Bill

Hazen, Hon. J. D. (Minister of Marine and Fisheries)
Army
French front, visit to, 1563
Pensions, 1610
Wet canteens, 1561
British Admiralty, recruiting for, 4163
Coal, transportation of, 4791
Dry docks, 5887
Fish and fisheries
Advisory Board, 2151
Canneries, 2117, 3399
Department
Appointments, 2149
Estimates, 2149
Dogfish, 2176
Exhibit at Toronto, 2033
Herring, 2036
Inspection, 2035
Lobsters, packing of, 5426
Ministry of, proposed, 2030
Officers, 2163
Transportation, 2031
White fish, 2159
Fisher, Mr. Ward, appointment of, 2170
Fisheries Act Amendment Bill, 3399
Gwatkin, General, 4426
Imperial War Conference, 1556
Lake of the Woods water level, 4178
Live stock, shipments, inspection of, 1842
Marine Department, estimates, 1815, 1836, 1881, 1912
Meat and Canned Foods Act, 2114, 3400
Minto, steamer, food supplies for, 2175
Naval Service Department, estimates, 4157
Ocean Telegraph Act, 2024, 2108
Overseas Military Forces, Minister of, 4426
Public Works Department estimates, 5890
Pugsley, Mr, statement of, 5274
Quebec harbour advances, 435, 577
Royal Naval College, 4163
St John harbour, 4187, 5892
Shipbuilding, 1557, 1665, 1912, 4164

Hazen, Hon. J. D.—*Con.*
Universal Radio Syndicate, Limited, 2024, 2108
War-time Elections Bill, 5717
Heals station rifle range, 1573, 1675
Heatherton, N.S, mail contract, 1817
Henderson, Mr. Geo. F., K.C., position of, 4010, 4211, 4243
See O'Connor
High Commissioner, Canadian, Office of, 4177
High cost of living, 129, 961, 2076, 2055
Yukon, in, 2199
See also Customs Tariff Act; Food Products; Price; O'Connor.
Highways, improvement of, 1217
Hindu immigration, 2145
Hobbs, Mr. Hugh, 1228
Home Defence, 336, 1038, 2628, 3955
Officers, recruiting of, 3134
Homesteads
Patents, delay of, 3759
Regulations, 1741, 1746
Settlers' names, 1819
See also Dominion Lands Act Amendment Bill
Hopetown post office, 989, 1474
Horses. *See* Agriculture
Hospitals
Marine, 1953
Military
Canadian Hospital No. 8, 1674
Conditions in, 54, 59, 464
Construction of in Canada, 4045
European, 527
Hospital trains, 2205
Parliament Hill, on, 1228
See Military Hospital Commission, *and* Canadian Army Medical Service
House of Commons
Accountant's office, lease of premises, 5703
Business of the
Adjournments. *See also general title* Adjournment
Ascension Day, 1422
Dominion Day, 2620
Imperial War Conference, for, 117, 597
Victoria Day, 1628
See also general title Adjournment
Daily routine orders, 1423, 1524
Morning sittings, 2619, 2755, 2833
Private Bills, extension of time, 585
Saturday sittings, 344, 2569
Wednesday sittings, 324
Clerk of the House, retirement of Dr. Flint, 6043, 6069
Committees, select standing, 296, 1956
Reports of, 2054
Estimates, 2359, 5784, 6045
House of Commons—*Con.*
Hansard, cost of, 607
Members
Active service, on, 713
Deceased, tributes to, 3
New, introduction of, 7
Sessional indemnity of, 5790, 6043
Messengers, proposed increases in salaries to, 4684, 6053
Officials
Appointments, 586, 642, 843, 1956
Deputy Sergeant-at-arms, 3
Library, clerk in, 2832
Pages, chief of, 522
Reporting Branch, 522, 5636, 5702, 5786, 5949
Salary increases to, 4834
Secretaryship abolished, 5702
Translator, Chief, 522
Troop, Mr. Herbert D., 434
Returns, complaint of delay in bringing down, 1373
Sergeant-at-Arms, death of, 6069
Speaker, election of, 1
See Speaker
Speaker's quarters, 5784
Effects removed and returned, 2058
Stenographers, 5788
Vacancies, 1, 605, 2836
Howe, Lieut. M. J., position of, 6066
Hudson Bay Railway
Expenditure, 596, 900
Terminals, 2205
See Canadian Government Railways
Hughes, Mr. J. J. (Kings, P.E.I.)
Address in reply to the Governor General's Speech, 231
Naval affairs, 236
Purchase of war supplies, 232
Record of the present administration, 231
The Ross rifle, 235
Statements of ex-Minister of Militia, 234
Agricultural Instruction Act, payments under, 455
Bartlett, Major, 4292, 4416
Bruce report, publication of, 3845
Campbell, Capt. G. H., 4508
Canadian Northern Railway, acquisition of, 5044
De Wolf, Fred. T., 5703
Ex-Minister of Militia, correspondence relating to resignation of, 991
Fullerton, Major T. F., 4508
Government Railways Act amendment, 4352, 4385
Government railways, management and operation of, 783
Grain for breweries and distilleries, 1177

Hughes, Mr. J. J.—*Con.*
Hardy, Lieut. M. R., 4509
Intoxicating liquor, 4396, 4404
Carriage on government railways, 591
James Simmonds Co., 5122
Labourers from the United States, 1193
Machine guns, 452
Magdalen islands steamship service, 2302
McQueen, Lieut. W. A., 4508
Military District No. 6, 5237
Military service, 2971
Referendum, 2977
Moffatt, Lieut. R. J., 5361
Potatoes
Marketing of, 5989
Powdery scab, 2269
Prince Edward Island
Medical officers, 4563
Patriotism of men of the province, 2974
Railway, widening of, 3902, 3945
Steamship service, 660, 3954
Princess Louise Fusiliers officers, 5271
Quebec, recruiting in, 2972, 2977
Ross rifle, 235
Shipbuilding, 1335
Souris breakwater, 3871
Steamship services, 2326
United Mine Workmen of Nova Scotia, 802
War-time Elections Bill, 5664

Hughes, Sir Sam (Victoria, Ont.)
Address in reply to the Governor General's Speech, 253
Appreciation of British military assistance, 253
Personal attitude and policy, 254, 271
Col. Armand Lavergne, 256
Dorchester campaign, 255
Canadian troops in the South African war, 256
Troubles in administration of military affairs, 256
Status of Canadian forces, 259
Military equipment, 262
Appointment of General Steele, 264
Method of purchasing war supplies, 265
Disposition and command of Canadian forces, 268
Recruiting, 269
Canadian industries and the war, 270
Army
Badges of identification, 5953
Canteens, 808
Enlistment, voluntary, 2434-2449
Medical service, 537, 4199, 4466
Recruiting
Correspondence with Prime Minister, 3090
Officers in Quebec, 3135
Rejected men, 3099

Hughes, Hon. Sir Sam—*Con.*
Soldiers, voting of, 4898
60th Battalion, 525
Bruce, Dr., report of, 602
Canadian overseas forces
Despatch of to the front, 574
Disposition and command of, 268
Status of, 259
Canteens, open, 536
Currie, Mr. J. A., statement of, 5773
Hospitals, military—Bruce and Babtie commissions, 538
Irish, Mr. Mark, statements of, 2707
Lessard, General, 368
Maclean, Mr. A. K., statements of, 2777
Military equipment, 262
Military service, 3135
Authority of Canada, 2435
Classes, calling out by, 3137
Compulsion, advantages of, 2438
Correspondence with Prime Minister, 2434, 2446, 2449
Labour, requirements of, 2441
Recruiting, alleged retarding of, 2442
Officers
Reversion in rank—pay in such cases, 5423
Unemployed, 573
Overseas Military Forces, Minister of, 4198, 4207, 4419, 4422, 4444
Administrative staff, 4956, 4959
Pay and Records Office, 3106
Recruiting, 269, 366, 379
Correspondence with Prime Minister, 2446
Lessening of, reasons for, 2442
Resignation of, 602
Ross rifle, 416, 480-493, 2451
Steele, General, appointment of, 264
Von Donop, Stanley, 523
War supplies, method of purchasing, 265

Hughes, Brig.-Gen. W. S., position of, 5361

Hyde, Mr. J. W., position of, 301

Hydrographic surveys, 4173

Immigration
Agents, 1737, 1754
Clergymen and priests employed as, 5361
Montreal, 5122
Quebec, 5122
United States, in, 4914, 5361
Chinese. *See* Chinese Immigration Act Amendment Bill
Department, estimates, staff and salaries, 4914
Deportation and rejection, 803
Figures, 803
Forms, printing of in French, 899, 3133, 3134

Immigration—*Con.*
French-Canadians in the United States, 4914
Hindu, 1763
Inspection, 803
Military service, exemption of immigrants from, 1572
Officers
Salaries, 2245
Windsor, at, 2357
Quarantine stations, 5306, 5312
Regulations, 372, 525
Regulations, Chinese immigration, 447
Rejection of undesirables at N. B. ports, 454
Rimouski, immigrants landed at, 4151
United States, from, 1739, 1747
See also Emigration

Imperial Munitions Board
Clerks, 305
Construction of ships by, 1661, 1663, 1913
Imports, 1978
Labour, 1985
Employees, 5271

Imperial preference, 1532, 1584

Imperial War Cabinet and Imperial War Conference
Adjournment of Parliament, 117, 596, 603
Announcement of meeting, 42
Attendance of Canadian Prime Minister, 597, 603, 1525
Correspondence with Colonial Secretary, 5, 24
Minutes of, extracts from, 2354
Proceedings of, 1525
Cattle embargo, 1535
Dominions overseas, constitutional relations of, 1528, 1531
Development and control of natural resources, 1532
Imperial preference, 1532
India, representation of, soldiers' graves, 1534
References to, 15, 24, 42, 148, 294
Statements by British Prime Minister, 2354
Statement by Mr. Hazen, 1556

Imperial War Graves Commission, 1534

Income War Tax Bill. Res., 3765. 1r., 3793. 2r., 4070. Com., 4070, 4102, 4124. 3r., 4638. Senate amdts., 5475; no precedent, 5476, 5883; amendment proposed: Mr. Pardee, 4639; ruled out, 4648

India, representation of,—Imperial War Conference, 1534

Indians
Agents, Bear River, 1569
Department of Indian Affairs, estimates, 1891, 2340, 2346
Lands of, 1887, 2348, 2389
Cutting timber on, 1889, 1901
Surveys of, 1894
Valuation and protection of, 1887
See also, under this head, Provinces *and* Reserves
Provinces, in
British Columbia, 653, 1896, 2340
New Brunswick, 1889
Northwest Provinces and Territories, 1894
Nova Scotia, 1887, 2349
Ontario, 1886
Quebec, 1886
Reserves, 989
Blackfoot, 2389
Caughnawaga, 1735
Digby, 304
Edmunston, 4920
Kitsilano, 1129, 1899
Okanagan, 1378, 2341
Sydney, 3663
Royal Commission, British Columbia, 653, 1038, 1896

Industrial and Scientific Research Bureau
Advisory council, 5279
Expenses, 5276
See also Research Council Bill *and* Technical education

Industrial Disputes Investigation Act. *See* Labour

Industrial requirements *See* Labour

Inland Revenue
Department
Appointments in 1916, 758
Employees at Montreal, 758
Estimates, 2360, 3817
Expenditure, 2380
Preventive, officers, 3837, 3847
Staff and salaries, 2360, 3380

Insolvent Traders. *See* Criminal Code Amendment Bills

Inspection and Sale Act Amendment Bill. Res., 4065. 1r., 4070. Withdrawn, 5887

Insurance
Civil Service, 3503
Premiums of men in military service, 3557
See also Criminal Code Amendment Bills

Insurance Act of 1910 Reenactment Bill. 1r., 1724. 2r., 2100. Ref. to Com., 2104. Com., 3848, 4138, 5196. 3r., 5205. Sen. amdts., 5956

Insurance Act Amendment Bills
Mr. W. H. Bennett
Bill No 45; 1r., 1037; withdrawn, 1157
Bill No. 50; 1r., 1568

Intercolonial Railway. *See* Canadian Government Railways

Interest Act Amendment Bill. 1r., 2569. 2r., 3401. Com., 3401. 3r., 3402

Interest on judgments, 900

Interior Department
Appointments to under section 21, 1351
Calgary offices, 668
Estimates, 652, 1344, 1735, 4916
Expenditure, 1344
French-speaking employees of, 2340
Orders in Council relating to, 6000
Political activity of employees, 2349

Internal Economy Commission, 45

International Fisheries Commission, 892

International surveys, 1735

Interprovincial bridges, 3888

Intoxicating liquors
Army camps, in *See* Army
Manufacture and sale of, 454
Prohibition of, 2008
See also "The Fiddlers" *and* Canada Temperance Act
Prosecutions for sale of, 1575
Sale of, 3818
See also Provincial Prohibitory Legislation

Inverness harbour improvements, 5325

Irish-Canadian Rangers. *See* Army

Jack, Mr. E. Bryden, position of, 4508

Jaffray, Mr. J. P., position of, 4062

Jails. *See* Penitentiaries

Jameson, Mr. Clarence (Digby)
Fisheries, proposed ministry of, 2026
Military Service Bill, 2969
Soldier Settlement Board, 3784
Technical education, 1243

James Simmonds Co., The, purchase of goods from, 5122

Jamesville breakwater, 5328

Jenkins, Lieut.-Col. S. R., duties and pay of, 5422

Joffre, General, 613

Judges Act Amendment Bill. Res., 1973. 1r., 1978. 2r., Com., 2136. 3r., 2137. Sen. amdt., 5954, 6062

Judgments, interest on, 900
See Interest Act Amendment Bill

Justice
Administration of, 1805
Baugh, Edward Levi, case of, 1814

Justice—*Con.*
Department, estimates, 1805, 5097. 5794, 5896, 6033, 6049
Exchequer Court
Cases, 335
Expenses, 1811
Publications, 5804
Judges
Appointment of, 1806
Provincial commissions, on, 593
Salaries, 1973, 5798, 5954
Saskatchewan and Ontario, 1973
Yukon, 5896
Minister of, payments to, 898, 1225
Provincial legislatures, powers of, 1807, 1811
Supreme Court, Chief Justice of, special allowance to, 6049

Kay, Mr. William F. (Missisquoi)
Ballots for overseas forces, 452
Food Controller's office,employees, 3502
Foster, Mr. A. De Witt, 303
Fuel Controller, staff of, 4245
Oleomargarine, prohibition of, 304
Parliament buildings, marble for, 2833
War profits and income tax—cost of collection, 4686

Kelly, Thomas, treatment of in penitentiary, and release of, 896, 4926, 5273, 5794

Kemp, Sir Edward (Minister of Militia and Defence)
Army
Camps, sale of liquor in, 815
Discharges, 3096
Enlistments
Total, 3098
Voluntary, 3381
Forestry battalions, 3950
Medical service, 3967
Officers
Pay of, 1628
Retention of on leave, 5902
Salutes to, 5425
Surplus, 3103
Pay and Records office staff, 3104
Rejected men, 3099
Soldiers
Behaviour of, 5235
Personal requests concerning, 4203
Separation allowances, 4203
Civil servants, enlisted, pay and separation allowances to, 663
Expeditionary Force, disposition of, 2356
Home defence campaign, 2628
Irish-Canadian Rangers, 195
Lens, valour of Canadian soldiers at, 5195
Military service, 2620, 3239
Classes, 3357
Discharges from army, 3096
Exceptions, 3270

Kemp, Sir Ed.—*Con.*
Exemptions, 2624
Home defence, 2628
Quebec, recruiting in, 2626
Referendum, 2623
Voluntary enlistment, 2624
Militia and Defence Department, estimates, 3949, 3967, 3980, 4044, 5218
Officers, alleged surplus of, 562
Pensions
Canadians in Imperial forces, to, 4688
Prisoners of war, 666
Money orders and parcels for, 714
Recruiting, 562
British subjects in the United States, 2482
Quebec, in, 2626
War affairs, Government, administration of, 3381
War Purchasing Commission, purchases by, 341
156th Battalion, 523

Kentville armoury
Caretaker, 4509
Militia stores, 4510

Knight, Mr. N. H. R., position of, 4952

Knowles, Mr. William E. (Moosejaw)
Army
Officers' wives, passports for, 3996
Soldiers, votes for, 4690, 4806, 4877
Budget, 887
Free wheat, 889
Canada Grain Act, proposed amendment, 2954
Canadian Government railways
Private cars, 4938
Intercolonial, appointment of officials, 659
Canadian Northern railway, acquisition of, 4637, 5022
Civil Service salaries, 2946
Coal, shortage of, 2294
Western supply of, 4621
Coalition government, 2901
Daylight saving, 3686
Farming industry, development of, 1787
Flax industry, 4683
Flour prices, 5214
Food control, 2002
Free wheat, 889
Gordon Divorce Bill, 5498
Immigration
Chinese and Hindu, 2141
United States, from, 1742
Indians, British Columbia Commission, 653
Industrial and scientific research, 5277
Inland Revenue Department estimates, 2371-2381

Knowles, Mr. W. E.—*Con.*
Intercolonial railway, appointment of officials, 659
Interior Department employees, political activities of, 2350
Legislators, free transportation for, 4935
Military service, 2895
Date of second reading of Bill, 2322
Referendum, 2900
Senate amendments, 4665
Mining industry, 657
Moosejaw, enlistments at, 5122
Moosejaw News, patronage, 2708
Mounted Police, Royal Northwest, 4670
Postal clerks, salaries, 2708
Prices, contract fixing of, 385, 1617
Public works expenditure, 5333
Racing meets, limitation of, 324
Renault, Raoul, appointment of, 2371
Seed grain, 4678
Collections, 2351
Shipbuilding, British Columbia, 4940
Tariff revision, 1785
Taxation, income, 4075, 4105
Toronto, Hamilton and Buffalo railway, 2614
Toronto Telegram, statement of, 5085
Trade and Commerce Department, estimates, 2338
War charities, 5493
War-time Elections Bill, 5637, 5658, 5721, 5810, 5818, 6083

Kyte, Mr. George W. (Richmond)
Address in reply to the Governor General's Speech, 195
Appointment of Senators for Nova Scotia, 196
The high cost of living—war profits, 197
National Service Commission, 200
Resignation of ex-Minister of Militia, 201
Canadian Army Medical Service, 201
Separation allowances, 203
Political patronage in military affairs, 203
Army
Medical service, 201
Soldiers' assigned pay, 3224
Bear River post office site, 1378, 1569
Budget, 956
Free wheat, 956
Business profits, 959
High cost of living, 961
Control of foodstuffs in Australia, 963
Taxation of business profits, 965
Canadian Northern Railway, acquisition of, 4041, 5010, 5165
Censors at Louisburg, 4008, 4048
Civil Serice appointments, 647

Kyte, Mr. G. W.—*Con.*
Coal, 1998
Shortage of, 1919
Cost of living, O'Connor Commission report, 700, 961, 3914, 4010
Flour, 1039
Food control, 961, 988
Customs Department officials, 5101
Dawson post office, 4952
Dredge Cape Breton, loss of, 596, 1024, 3831
East Bay wharves, 5315
False Creek dredging, 900, 1126
Fish and fisheries, 2050
Advisory Board, 2152
Dogfish, 2179
Officers, 2157, 2161
Flags on public buildings, 4146
Flint, Dr., retirement of, 6044
Flour, price of, 1039
Food control, 1998
Fraser river channel improvements, 1126
Gordon Divorce Bill, 5904
Heals station rifle range, 1573
Imperial Munitions Board Labour, 1985
Inland Revenue Department officials, 2377
Intercolonial railway — improvement of grades, 456
Judges' salaries, 1974
Leblanc, Dr. B. A., 2283, 4416
Lewis machine guns, 590
Louisburg
Censors, 4008
Pilot Commissioners, 3677
Wireless station, 5122
Macdonald, Dr. J A., 2283
Mail contracts, 3636, 3639
Maritime Provinces military affairs, 5228
Military District No. 6, 5228
Military Hospitals Commission, 4243
Military service
Exemptions, 5271
Tribunals, 3158
Militia Department estimates, 5221
National Service Commission, 200
Naval Service officers at Halifax, 6000
Neilly, Dr., position of, 2707
Nova Scotia public works, 5315, 5324
O'Connor report, 4010
Ogilvie Flour Mills Company, Limited, 1818, 2389, 3677
Ottawa Journal-Press—correction of statement, 3759
Pacific Dredging Company, 1126
Parliamentary secretaryships, 4211
Pensions, 6018
Point Tupper mail service, 3502
Pommery, Mr. Samuel, 4952
Port Malcolm wharf, 3866

Kyte, Mr. G. W.—*Con.*
Proportional representation, 915
Rainbow, H.M.C.S., sinking of vessels by, 457
Recruiting, 2482
Returned soldiers, appointment of to goveernment positions, 6055
Richmond county medical officers, 3758
Ross rifle factory, taking over of by the Government, 663
Salt, shortage of, 3556
Shipbuilding, 5434
Steamship services, 2325
Sydney industrial sites, 3956
Taxation
Business profits, 965
Income, 4115, 5291
Telegraph and telephone lines, 5336
Turner, Mr. Harvey, 1469
Urquhart, Mr. Hector, 5367
Vancouver drill hall site, 456
War supplies
Munitions contracts, 5526
Purchase of, 4053
Waterford explosion, 5775
Women munitions workers, 4063
Yukon
Administrator, 5122
Commissioner, 3677

Labour
Attitude of on military service, 2426, 2488, 2451, 2604, 2663, 2795, 2871, 2958, 3725, 3732
Australian labour troubles, 698
Bureaus, 118
Chinese labourers, 2139
Conditions on munition work, 2492
Department administration, 1269
Assistant Deputy Minister, abolition of office of, 686
Estimates, 686, 1112, 1166, 1989, 3652
Staff and salaries, 686
See also Mines and Minerals, Coal
Fair wages and inspection officers, 3652
Farm labourers from the United States, 665, 1193, 1740, 1747, 3504, 4512
Government elevators, claims by employees, 386
Imperial Munitions Board, 1985
Industrial Disputes Investigation Act, 1112, 1166, 1270
Military service, attitude to
See under this head Attitude
Strikes. *See* Coal *and* Thetford
Brantford moulders, 2322
Sorel strike, 1912, 1935
Yukon miners, 3086
Thetford mines. *See that title*

Labour—*Con.*
United Mines Workmen of Nova Scotia, 802
Women munitions workers, 4063
Lacasse, Mr. Isidore, employment of, 5272
Lachance, Mr. Arthur (Quebec Centre)
Canadian Northern Railway, acquisition of, 5080, 5192
Faguy, Gaudiose, 2284
High cost of living, 2922
Military Service Bill, 2919
St. Charles river dam, 2525
Lafortune, Mr. David A. (Montcalm)
Canadian Northern Railway, acquisition of, 5072, 5187
Capital punishment, 632
Coalition government, 3014
Criminal Code amendment, jurors, 4335
Military service, 3004
Referendum, 3013
Montreal, postmaster, 582
Ottawa Journal-Press, statement in, 3085
War supplies, munitions contracts, 5541
Lake of the Woods water level, 2775, 4178
Lalor, Mr. Francis R. (Haldimand)
Budget, 1096
Comparision of Conservative and Liberal administrations, 1097
Revenue and expenditure, 1098
Our part in the war, 1098
Fiscal policies, 1101
Reciprocity, 1103
Dominion Canners Company, 1105
Civil Service salaries, 2245
Coal, 2097
War-time Elections Bill, 5876
Lanctot, Mr. Roch (Laprairie-Napierville)
Arthurs, Lieut.-Col. James, 5914
Belford, Capt. J. F., 5703
Bernard, Lieut.-Col. E. S., 5703
Breadner, Mr. R. W., 3676
Budget, 1221
The farming situation, 1221
Free wheat, 1221
Embargo on hay, 1222
Canada's prosperity, 1223
The Nationalist party, 1224
Payments to Minister of Justice, 1225
Business Profits War Tax, 3676
Canadian Bank of Commerce, 4686
Canadian Northern Railway acquisition of, 5065
Caron, Mr. Hector, 4151
Davidson, Sir Charles, payments to, 898
Dean, Lieut. R. I., 5703
Doherty, Hon. C. J., payments to, 898, 1225
Food Controller, staff of, 4413
Lanctot, Mr. R.—*Con.*
Fuel Controller, assistant to, 4152
Hay, embargo on, 1222
Ice breakers, 1818
Imperial Munitions Board employees, 5271
Intercolonial railway, damage claims, 2707
Judges' salaries, 5801
Laporte, Mr. Hormidas, 4510
Military Service, 2962
National Service Commission employees, 4787
National Trust Company, directors of, 4685, 4417
Plaxton, Mr. C. P., 4416
Postmaster General, recruiting by, 4415
Rimouski
Immigrants, landing of, at, 4151
Medical officers, 4509
Public works employees, 4244
War measures, 525
War Veterans Association, 1574
Wealth, conscription of, 2965
Landry, Mr. Justice, findings of, 3109, 3609, 4512, 5248
Lapointe, Mr. E. (Kamouraska)
Civil Service employment of men in higher offices, 1260
Dussault, Albert, employment of, 457
Exchequer Court Act Amendment Bill, 1422
Inland Revenue Department estimates and officials, 361, 2364, 3825
Military service
Contraventions of Act, 3341
Exemptions, 3304, 6002
Voluntary enlistment, 2514
Referendum proposals, 2521
Provisions of the Militia Act, 2519
Quebec's position, 2515
Murray Bay railway service, 617
Quebec, available men for military service in, 3255
Riviere Ouelle-Murray Bay steamship service, 643
St. Roche Traverse light-keeper, 1378
War-time Elections Bill, 5807
Women in the Civil Service, 1260
Lapointe, Mr. Louis A. (Montreal, St. James)
Alcoholic liquors, revenue from sale and manufacture of, 304
Army—Soldiers, voting of, 4725
Bank Act amendment, 1037
Canadian Northern Railway acquisition of, 5036
Grain, fixing of price of, 3704
Hansard, cost of, 607
Military Service, 2770
Exemptions, 2773, 3226, 3308

Lapointe, Mr. Louis A.—*Con.*
Quebec's contribution of men, 3256
Recruiting, 2772
Quebec electoral lists, 6002
Senate Hansard, cost of, 1571
War-time Elections Bill, 5621, 5639, 5722, 5741, 5759, 5865

Laporte, Mr. Hormidas, payments to, 4510

Latchford, Ont., plant and buildings, sale of, 5706

Laurentian, steamer, 4563

Laurier, Rt. Hon. Sir Wilfrid (Quebec, East)
Address in reply to, the Governor General's Speech, 17
Canada's Governor General, 17
The war situation, 18
German peace proposals, 19
Our soldiers at the front, 20
Laxity of present administration, 20
Control of our military forces, 20
Equipment of Canadian troops, 23
The fiftieth Anniversary of Confederation, 24
Imperial War Conference, 24
Amqui-St. Leonard mail contract, 3903
Army
Camps, sale of liquor in, 813
Control of, by Canada, 20
Discharges, 3111
Equipment, 23
Recruiting
Quebec, in, 2395
Retarding of, 3094
Rejected men, 3101
Soldiers, voting of, 2403, 3727
Army Act, regulations, 3111
Balfour, Rt. Hon. A. J., address to, 1772
Canadian Northern Railway acquisition of, 4216, 4625, 4635, 5128
Capital punishment, 622
Coalition government, 3727
Correspondence with Sir Robert Borden, 2690
Confederation, fiftieth anniversary of, 24
Connaught, the late Duchess of, 610
Daylight saving, 3681
Defence of Canada, 358
Fisheries protection service, 4166
Galt, Mr. Justice
Report of, 2057
Rogers, Hon. Robert, criticism of, by, 599
Government Railways Act amendment, 4384
Grand Trunk Pacific Railway Branch Lines Company, 1375

Laurier, Rt. Hon. Sir W.—*Con.*
House of Commons
Business of the House, 1524
Morning sittings, 2619, 2775
Saturday sittings, 325, 2569
Wednesday sittings, 325
Clerk of the House, retirement of, 6070
Officials, appointments of, 586
Rights of House in dealing with taxation, 5479
Speaker's quarters, 5784
Imperial War Conference, 24
Adjournment of Parliament, 118
Visit of Prime Minister to, 1542
Insurance, 3848
Intoxicating liquor, 4397
Landry, Mr. Justice, report of, 4152, 5250
Mace, vote of thanks to donors of, 1469
McLeod-Tellier Commission, 2357, 5245
Members, deceased, tributes to, 4
Migratory birds, 3657
Military Service, 3111, 3254
Appeals, 3177
Board of Selection, 5084
Burden of Proof, 3319
Classes, 3132, 3140
Conscription, need of, considered, 2396
Contraventions of Act, 3324, 3337
Exceptions, 3559
Exemptions, 3207, 3362
Labour, attitude of, 3725
Men, available, 3724
Parliament, power of, 2392, 3723
Persons liable for service, 3116
Quebec enlistments, 2398
Referendum, 2403, 3721, 3728
Senate amendments, 4663
Tribunals, 3149, 3165, 3296, 3575, 5880
Votes for soldiers, 3727
Mounted Police, Royal Northwest, 4668
National Service Commission, 309
Newsprint paper, 757
Overseas Military Forces, Minister of, 4195
Parliament
Extension of term of, 2396, 3420, 3484
Printing of, 5950, 5952
Parliamentary secretaryships, 4195, 4206
Pelagic Sealing Treaty, claims under, 5972
Point of order—Hon. Robert Rogers' reference to Mr. Justice Galt, 599
Prisoners, proposed enlistment of, 1014
Quebec and Saguenay Railway purchase and completion of, 303
Quebec harbour advances, 435
Railway Act, the, 606
Railway material, removal of to France, 310, 1372
Rogers, Hon. Robert, resignation of, 4739

Laurier, Rt. Hon. Sir W.—*Con.*
Ross rifle, 477, 3487
Scientific and industrial research, 3911
Senate, proposel change in constitution of, 1148
Right of to amend taxation bills denied, 5479
Soldier Settlement Board, 1163
Soldiers, votes for, 2403, 3727
Speaker, election of, 2
Taxation
Business profits, 1637
Income, 4084, 4114, 4122, 4132
Senate's right to amend taxation bills denied, 5479
Transcontinental railways, removal of rails to France, 1229, 1266
United States, declaration of war by, 612
Viviani, M., address to, 1367
War
Expenditure, 476
Supplies, munitions contracts, 5518
Votes ($500,000,000), 585
War-time Elections Bill, 5421, 5572, 5637, 5652, 5706, 5805, 5849
Woman suffrage, 1499

Laval, steamer, 1470

Lavergne, Col. Armand, 256, 1038, 2619

Leblanc, Dr. B. A., employment of, 2283, 4416

Le Blanc, Maurice, position and salary of, 1816

Lefebvre, Major Alfred, position and pay of, 1037, 2618, 3003

Legislatures, members of provincial, free transportation. *See* Railway Act Amendment Bills

Leigh, Major, position of, 5422

L'Espérance, Hon. D. O., appointment of to Senate, 4511

Lemieux, Hon. Rodolphe (Rouville)
Abbotsford postmaster, 608
Address in reply to the Governor General's Speech, 136
National government, 136
The Opposition's duty, 137
Ross rifle, 137
True loyalty, 139
Attitude of the leader of the Opposition, 140
Great Britain's attitude in the war, 141
Quebec's view of the war, 141
What England and France are accomplishing, 142
Nationalism in Quebec, 143
The Dorchester election, 146
Recruiting in Quebec, 147

Lemieux, Hon. R.—*Con.*
The Imperial War Conference, 148
The fiftieth anniversary of Confederation, 150
Alcohol, distilling of, 3743
Angers, Captain, dismissal of, 758
Anglo-French delegates, visit of to Canada, 669
Army
Camps, sale of liquor in, 806, 840, 1226
Demobilization, plans for, 3118
Enlistment, 2463-2478
Recruiting in Quebec, 363, 3136
Recruits, urban and rural, 3135
Assistant Deputy Minister of Labour, suspension of, 690
Bell, steamer, 1377
Brindle, Mr. William, 3758
Canadian Northern Railway, acquisition of, 4043, 4217, 4278, 4554, 4600-4619, 5046 5184
Cattle, British embargo on, 987
Civil Service insurance, 3503
Civil Service salaries, 583, 1804, 2241
Enlisted men, pay of, 2254
Coal
Confiscation of by railways, 584
Ottawa prices of, 1320
Cold storage, 2076
Courcelette, steamer, 1377
Criminal Code amendments, 4464
Jurors, 4306
Customs
Duties payable on Crown's goods, 2127
Silks, valuation of for customs, 1574
Customs and immigration forms, 3133, 3134
"Defeat or Victory," 1473
Dorchester county election, 146
Dynamite outrages in Montreal, 5423
Elevator men, pay of, 2946
Exhibitions, 2260
Farmers' Bank, shareholders of, 301
Fish, transportation of, 3556
Foodstuffs, control of, 2471
France, promotion of trade with, 597, 2307
French-Canadians in the United States, 4914
French-speaking employees, Department of Agriculture, 2264
Gaspe steamship service, 2299
Gerrie, Mr. Charles, 4245
High cost of living, 2055, 2077
Hudson Bay railway, 5090
Immigration
Agents, 1760
Department, printing of forms in French, 899

Lemieux, Hon. R.—*Con.*
Hindus, of, 1763, 2144
Japanese, of, 2144
Indians—Caughnawaga hospital, 1886
Inland Revenue Department
Estimates, 3831
Officials, 3817
Montreal, at, 758
Insurance of war risks, 3557, 3589
Intercolonial railway, cars, shortage of, 1378
Intoxicating liquor
Prohibition of, 4401
Sale of, 3819
Jack, Mr. E. Bryden, 4508
Kelly, Thomas, 4926, 5794
Labour bureaus, 118
Laval, steamer, 1470
Lessard, General, 363, 2055
Levis railway, station, 2208
Magdalen Islands
Cable service, 5408
Steamship service, 2303
Mail matter, registration of, 668
Matane Harbour light, 1575
McWilliams, Mr., dismissal of, 2167
Military service
Burden of proof, 3318
Contraventions of Act, 3329
Enlistment — Canada compared with United States and France, 2463
Exceptions, 3560
Exemptions, 3131
Insurance of soldiers, 3557, 3589
Militia Act, provisions of, 2465
Persons liable to serve, 3117
Pledges of government, 2467
Quebec's position, 2473, 3137
Referendum, 2478
Regulations, 3316
Tribunals, 3158
Mining industry, development of, 4181
Mitchell, Private J. F., death of, 1377
Montreal postmaster, 523, 581
O'Connor, Mr. W. F., report of, 3746
Overseas Military Forces, Minister of, 4202, 4420, 4442
Parcel post, 2075
Parliamentary secretaryships, 4202, 4207, 4212, 4420
Parliamentary sessions, expense of, 1262
Quebec harbour advances, 577
Improvements, 3879
Quebec, Montmorency and Charlevoix; Quebec and Saguenay, and Lotbiniere and Megantic Railways, 4848, 5454
Railway Act, The, 3514, 3716
Railway company, advance to, 2100

Lemieux, Hon. R.—*Con.*
Ross rifle, the, 137
Rouville county mail carrier, 603
Ste. Anne bridge, 3888
Sainte Luce, changing of name, 673
St. Malo railway buildings, 1128
Soldiers, postage on parcels for, 1263
Soldier Settlement Board, 1165
Steamship service, France, 2307
Sulphur, embargo on, 4889
Taxation
Income, 3776, 4071, 4086
Wealth, 2469
Technical education, 1229, 1252
Telegraph service, 2108, 2113
Thompson, Mr., employment of, 4008
Vaudreuil bridge, 3888
Victoria bridge toll rates, 672
War, prisoners of, 4194
War-time Elections Bill, 5550, 5633, 5641
Washington Conference, Canadian delegates to, 1127
West Indies, promotion of trade with, 2289
Wharves, 1944

Lens, valour of Canadian soldiers at, 5195

Lessard, General, position and services of, 363, 365, 368, 2055

Levis railway station, 1129, 2208

Lewis, Mr. J. H., position of, 2944

Life insurance. *See* Insurance

Life saving. *See* Naval Service

Liquor. *See* Intoxicating liquors

Little Bras d'Or dredging, 3886

Live Stock. *See* Agriculture

Live Stock and Produce Bill. Res., 4287. 1r., 4292. Ref. to Com., 4417. Com., 5503. 3r., 5514

Loans
Farmers, to. *See* Bank Act Amendment Bills
Public. *See* Finance

Lockhart, Mr. Hugh, employment of, 1265

Lockport Cold Storage Company, 2202

Loggie, Mr. William S. (Northumberland, N.B.)
Budget, 1280
Reply to Mr. Crothers, 1280
Canada's contributions to the war, 1282
Taxation proposals, 1282
Freer trade policies, 1283, 1287
Free wheat, 1286
The Dominion Canners Company, 1289
Reply to Mr. Edward's criticism of Sir Wilfrid Laurier, 1290
Coalition Government, 2988

Loggie, Mr. W. S.—*Con.*
Dominion Canners Company, 1289
Fish and fisheries
Development of industry, 2047
Lobsters, 2049, 2155, 5426
Free wheat, 1286
Government railways, branch lines, 2223
Military Service, 2984
Referendum, 2986
Recruiting, 380
Shipbuilding, 1929
Soldiers, voting of, 4778
Steamship service, 2311
Taxation
Business profits, 1645
Income, 4069

Lord's Day Observance Act
Suggested suspension of, 936

Lotbiniere and Megantic Railway
Completion and operation of, 4948, 5452

Louisburg
Pilot Commissioners, 3677
Wireless station at, 5122

Louisville post office, 899

Lovett, James, dismissal of, 453, 759

Loyal Orange Order, 85, 91

Macdonald, Mr. E. M. (Pictou)
Address in reply to the Governor General's Speech, 47
The fiftieth anniversary of Confederation, 47
Imperial War Conference, 47
The War, 48
The present Government and the war, 49
Extension of term of Parliament, 50
Canada's participation in wars of the Empire, 51
Recruiting, 51
Political patronage, 52, 55
Conscription, 54
Conditions in military hospitals, 54, 59
Administration of military affairs, 54
Government expenditures, 60
The winning of the war, 61
Aeroplane service, 805, 844
Army
Allowances, separation, 336, 383, 387, 4006
Camps and canteens, 535, 820, 1266
Canteen system in England, 718
Conscription, 54, 893
Criticism of military affairs, duty of the Opposition, 571
Enlistment of Canadians in the United States, 3758
Hospital No. 8, 1674
Irish-Canadian Rangers, 195, 458

Macdonald, Mr. E. M.—*Con.*
Medical service, 527, 3962
Pensions, 845
Recruiting, 51, 360, 372
Advertising of, cost, 986
State of, 936
Unfit men, of, 697, 4006
United States, in, 3758, 3904
Soldiers
Farms, employment on, 1677
Medical treatment of, 3962
Voting of, 4692, 4704, 4729, 4741, 4786, 4792, 4834, 4876, 4887
Army and Navy Veterans, 5911
Assistant Deputy Minister of Labour, suspension of, 688
Babtie, report, Dr. Bruce's reply to, 669
Bull, Mr. Perkins, 1130
Canadian Government Railways
Cars, purchase of, 4928
Coal purchases, 664, 667, 3388
United States, in, 592
Employees Magazine, 452
Level crossing near Trenton, 304
Quebec and Saguenay, etc., 5460
Safety-first inspectors, 337
Steamers, purchase of, 669
See under this head Government Railways
Amendment Act *and* Intercolonial Railway
Canadian Northern Railway acquisition of, 4030, 4283, 4544, 4606-4618, 4628-4632, 4864, 4996, 5124
Carson, Major General, 986
Coal, Western mining of, 159, 614
Criminal Code amendments, jurors, 4296, 4322
Customs duties on goods of the Crown 1979, 1982
Dominions Royal Commission, 2338
Emigration of Canadians, 987
Food control, 2001, 3744
Supplies for Great Britain, 2260
France, trade with, 2312
Gordon Divorce Bill, 5904
Government Railways Act amendment, 4339, 4366, 4386
Grain, 4679
Gwatkin, General, 4419
Heals station rifle range, 1675
High cost of living, 695, 3935
Hospitals, military, 54, 59
Hudson Bay railway expenditure, 900, 5088
Immigration
Chinese of, 2143
Regulations, 447

Macdonald, Mr. E. M.—*Con.*
Indians, 2349
Kitsilano, 1129
Industrial Disputes Investigation Act, 1123
Inland Revenue Department
Estimates, 3825, 3827, 3833, 2842
Expenditure, 2380, 2384
Officials, 2360
Intercolonial Railway
Cars, 2226
Employees, promotion of, 779
Operation of, 776
Judges' salaries, 5955
Kentville armoury
Caretaker, 4509
Militia stores, 4510
Kitsilano Indian reserve, 1129
Loan ($100,000,000), 4416, 4621
Lobster fishing, 2155, 5425
Master mariners, 4416
Medically unfit persons, certificates to, 5423
Military bands, 4044
Military service, 2947
Board of Selection, 2954
Contraventions of Act, 3339
Exemptions, 2955
Labour, attitude of, 2958
Quebec, position of, 2959
Referendum, 2961
Minto, steamship—food supplies, 2179
Munitions contracts, 4928
New Glasgow-Mountville mail service, 1037
O'Connor, Mr. W. F., report of, 3935
Overseas Military Forces, Ministry of, 4417, 4442
Overseas Militia Department, non-combatant positions in, 4786
Parliament, extension of term of, 3478
Pelagic Sealing Treaty, claims under, 5958
Pensions, 6005-6033
Canadians in Imperial Forces, for, 4662
Pictou
Freight, handling of, at, 303
Marine and Fisheries agency, 304, 596, 1937
Rural mail routes, 900
Post Office Department, estimates, 2352
Prince Edward Island
Car ferry, 2305
Freight for, 1037
Steamship service, 3389
Prisoners of war, 666
Provincial governments, duties payable by, 2119, 2129
Provincial legislatures, powers of, 1807
Public works expenditure, 1038
Railway Act, The, 3426, 3439, 3441
Railway Department, steamers purchased by, 669

Macdonald, Mr. E. M.—*Con.*
Railway employees, payment of salaries of, 5998
Robb, P.A., 1572
St. John harbour works, 5894
Scientific and industrial research, 3912
Senate, appointments to, 932
Shipbuilding, 802, 1325, 1341, 1914, 1934, 1661, 5430
Soldiers, votes for, 1393, 1399
Stellarton
Public building, 4951
Postmaster, 669, 897, 3758
Submarine situation, 1320, 1339
Taxation
Business profits, 1641
Income, 1652, 3775, 5884, 5886
Wealth, 3480
Taxation measures; Senate's power to amend denied, 5477
Technical education, 1241
Trade and Commerce, South America, 2331
United States
Labourers from, 665
Tariff, changes in, 1264
Vancouver Harbour Commissioners, 1575
Victoria Sealing Company, 5958
Walsh, J. J., 1675
War charities, 5482
War supplies
Munitions contracts, 5517
Political patronage in purchase of, 4050, 4053
Ross rifle, 477, 479
Trenton, contractors for, 303
Wealth, conscription of, 3480
Yukon territory, 1736

Macdonald, Dr. J. A., employment of, 2283

Macdonald, Mrs. Jessie, separation allowances to, 5361

Macdonell, Mr. A. C. (South Toronto)
Military service, 2847
Parliament, authority of, 2848
Quebec situation, 2852
Referendum, 2849
Reinforcements, need of, 2853
Railway Act, The, 3433, 3533
Soldiers, voting of, 2850

Mace, presentation of, 1468

Machine guns. *See* War supplies

Maclean, Mr. Alexander K. (Halifax)
Aldershot camp grounds, 3295, 3419
Apples, embargo on, 5776
Army
Allowances, 4001
Enlistments, 4152

Maclean, Mr. A. K.—*Con.*
Soldiers
Leave of absence for, 4005
Voting of, 1398, 4702, 4712, 4736, 4741, 4786, 4820, 4876, 4887, 4889, 4914, 5196
Atlantic mail service, 452
Baxter, Leslie E., 3418
Bay State Fish Company, 2321
Budget
Trade and financial condition of Canada, 722
Income and expenditure, 723
Political patronage, 726
Taxation of business profits, 727
Free wheat, 729
Encouragement of production, 733
Canadian Northern Railway, 5057
Censorship, 5493
Coal mining, 616
Companies Act Amendment Bills, 843, 1151, 5918, 5942
Customs—bonded goods, 1854
Digby government lands, 2321
Dodge, L. B., payments to, 306
Dredge Cape Breton, 1026
Dry docks, 4458, 5889, 5917
Eaton, Ernest, 3419
Flour, price of, 1059
Food Controller, powers of, 3943
France, trade with, 2314
Government Railways Act amendment, 4361
Halifax and Eastern Railway contractors, 304
Industrial and scientific research, 5281
Intercolonial Railway stations, naming of, 3386
International Fisheries Commission, 892
Letter carriers, salaries of, 581
Loan ($100,000,000), 343
Lockport Cold Storage Company, 2202
Lovett, Mr. James, dismissal of, 453
McLeod-Tellier Commission, 5252
Military District No. 6, 5229
Military hospitals, 4045
Military service, 2674
Classes, 3289
Enforcement, immediate, not desirable, 2681
Exemptions, 3218, 3209, 3309
Motor boat Alase, 5360
Moxom, Major, 4415
Muchaboom wharf, 304
Newsprint paper, 1645
Nickerson, William C., 2283
Nova Scotia Patrol Service, 5423
Outlook Publishing Company, 607

Maclean, Mr. A. K.—*Con.*
Parliament, extension of term of, 3420
Political patronage, 726
Public works expenditure, 5308
Renault, Raoul, appointment of, 2363
Ross rifle, 423, 426, 478
Salt, shortage of, 1373
Schaffner, Mr. L. P., dismissal of, 438
Scientific and industrial research, 3909, 3957
Senate, appointments to, 924
Shipbuilding, 1669, 5442
Senate, proposed change in constitution of, 1140
Soldier's cove wharf, 5339
Taxation
Income, 3766, 3767, 4070, 4111, 4124
Business profits, 727, 1660
Telegraph and telephone lines, 5386
United States, head tax on Canadians, 892
Vessels in government service, 1130
War supplies—mattresses and covers, 6065
War-time Elections Bill, 5595, 5637-5702, 5707-5771, 6072
Polling divisions under, 6070
Windsor Junction mail service, 5913

Maclean, Mr. W. F. (South York)
Address in reply to the Governor General's Speech, 130
Party co-operation, 130
National government, 132
Loans to farmers, 134
The winning of the war, 135
Canadian Northern railway, acquisition of, 4531
Civil Service, appointments and promotions, 2018
Conscription, 1550
Federal law and its enforcement, 3263
Food control, 3750
Government Railways Act amendment, 4362
Grain for breweries and distilleries, 1181
Imperial War Conference, 1548
Letter carriers, 1805
Loans to farmers, 134
Military service, 1550
Enforcement, 3263
Railway Act, The, 3423
Telegraph service, 2109
War supplies, purchases of by British Government, 4952
War-time Elections Act, 5593

MacNutt, Mr. Thomas (Saltcoats)
Aliens, enlistment of, 3656, 4413
Ottawa Journal-Press, statement of, 3655
Parker, Mr. R. G. M., 2201
Soldier Settlement Board, 3790
Tariff revision, 1718, 1727

Macpherson, Capt. Kenneth C., position and pay of, 4292, 4416, 4685

McCoig, Mr. A. B. (West Kent)
Army, soldiers' pay, 3217
Beans for seed, duty on, 671
Cold storage plants, 1628, 2078
Flour, price of, 1063
Food control, 2087
Grain, congestion in the West, 340
Henderson, Mr. Geo. F., K.C., 4243
Hogs, inspection of, 2271
Cholera, 2273
Loans to farmers, 1965
Military service, 2785
Exemptions, 3218
Potatoes, supply of, 936
Titus, Private John, 2237
Tractor engines, duty on, 674
Training camps in Canada, 899

McCraney, Mr. Geo. E. (Saskatoon)
Alcohol for public institutions, 5103
Army, medical service, 3995
Budget, 949
Taxation, 951
Policies, after the war, 953
Canadian Northern Railway, acquisition of, 4551, 4633, 5174
Coal, western mining of, 2184
Dominion Lands Act Amendment Bills, 1157, 3805, 3811
Elrose mail service, 899
Fuel, 1417
Homestead patents, delay in, 3759
Immigrants—exemption from military service, 1572
Industrial Disputes Investigation Act, 1166
Military service, 2558
Enforcement, 2560
Exemptions, 1572, 3221, 3369
Referendum, 2559
Parliament, railway transportation for members of, 3519
Provincial legislators, free transportation for, 300, 683
Railway Act, The, 3519
Seed grain indebtedness, 302, 1126
Soldiers, returned, care of, 475
Soldier Settlement Board, 1164
Taxation, income, 3778, 4075, 4094, 4099
War-time Elections Bill, 5559, 5643-5702, 5712

McCrea, Mr. Francis N. (Sherbrooke)
Budget, 1300
Taxation of business profits, 1300
The pulp and paper industry, 1302
Flour, price of, 1069
Horses, purchases of pure bred, 2279
Military service, 3035

McCrea, Mr. F. N.—*Con.*
Potatoes supply of, 1087
Pulp and paper industry, 1302, 1464
Railway Act, The, 3444
Sherbrooke exhibition grounds, 302
Taxation, business profits, of, 1463
War-time Elections Bill, 5862

McCurdy, Mr. F. B. (Parliamentary Secretary, Department of Militia and Defence)
Army camps, sale of liquor in, 833
Military Service Bill, 2890
Parliamentary secretaryships, 4210, 4450
War-time Elections Bill, 6085

McCutcheon, Stanley, dismissal of, 306

McGee, the late Thos D'Arcy, monument to 3899

McInnis, Mr. M. A., assistant to Fuel Controller, 5422

McKee, A. J., steamer, 669, 4925, 4939

McKenzie, Mr. Daniel D. (North Cape Breton)
Address in reply to the Governor General's Speech, 78, 83
The attitude of Nova Scotia, 79
Mal-administration of the present Government, 81, 89
Canada's duty in regard to the war, 80
Militia Department affairs and the late Minister, 82
Loyal Orange Order, 85
Political patronage in recruiting, 86
Voting of soldiers, 87
Representation of Cape Breton in the Senate, 89
Army
Camps, sale of liquor in, 826, 1567
Enlistment of Canadians in British Army, 385
Forestry battalions, 4509
Recruiting, 86
Soldiers' votes, 87, 4729, 4759
Baddeck mail contract, 1819
Bell, Mr. Alexander Graham, 5783
Budget, 1809
Record of the present Administration, 1090
Political patronage, 1092
Purchase of horses in Nova Scotia, 1093
Development and progress under late Administration, 1094
Canadian Northern Railway, acquisition of, 4039, 4521, 5032, 5162
Civil Service, promotions, 4667
Coal, 2005
Confiscation of by railways, 194

McKenzie, Mr. D. D.—*Con.*
Criminal Code amendment, jurors, 4305, 4330
Customs
Duties payable on Crown's goods, 2130
Officials, 5100
Preventive service, 1882
Dry docks, 4463
Fish and fisheries
Officers, 2170
Development of industry, 2045
Fisher, Mr. Ward, 2170
Flags on public buildings, 4147
Flour, 1879
High price of, 1076
Fuel, 1418
Control of, 2317
Government Railways Act amendment, 4375
Grain for breweries and distilleries, 1178
Highland Brigade, 552
House of Commons—messengers, 6053
Imperial Munitions Board clerks, 305
Imperial War Conference, 1565
Indians, 1893
Sydney reserve, 3664
Inland Revenue Department
Estimates, 2379, 3840
Expenditure, 2379, 2388
Officials, 3840
Insurance, 2102, 4393
Intercolonial Railway
Boisdale contracts, 4415
Claims, 3416
Operation of, 784
Rates on coal, 4292
Stations at North Sydney, McKinnon's Harbour and Christmas Island, 2227
Sydney train service, 2222
Jamesville breakwater, 5328
Judges' salaries, 1976
Labour, 1174, 1988
Conditions on munition work, 2493
Letter carriers, salaries of, 583
Little Bras d'Or dredging, 3886
Magdalen Islands cable service, 5407
Mail contracts, 3637
Margaree harbour improvements, 5336
Matheson post office, 3502
Military service
Appeals, 3185
Burden of proof, 3322
Classes, 3289
Contraventions of Act, 3588
Exemptions, 3232
Labour, attitude of, 2492

McKenzie, Mr. D. D.—*Con.*
Referendum, 2498
Tribunals, 3173
Morton, Dr. A., position of, 5706, 5913
North Sydney
Customs service, 607, 1852
Railway station, 2227
Nova Scotia steamship service, 2286
O'Connor, Mr. W. F., report of, 3753
Investigations of, 3653, 3928
Overseas Military Forces, Minister of, 4424, 4449
Parliamentary secretaryships, 4449
Patenaude, Hon. E. L., resignation of, 2494
Pelagic Sealing Treaty, claims under, 5975
Pensions, 6017
Provincial Governments, duties payable by, 2130
Public works—harbour improvements, 4186
Quarantine service, 3756
Quebec railways, 5473
Racing Form, The, 306, 336, 896
Railway Act, The, 3533
Railway mail clerks, 3650
Renault, Raoul, appointment of, 2368
St. Peter's canal, 3406
St. Pierre Miquelon mail service, 3649
Schaffner, Mr. L. P., dismissal of, 443
Shipbuilding, 1566
Soldiers, votes for, 1397
Soldier's cove wharf, 5337, 5341
Soldier Settlement Act, administration of, 4917
Steamship services, 2324, 2286
Submarine situation, 1333
Taxation, income, 4128, 4135, 4658
Technical education, 1239
Telegraph and telephone lines, 4191, 5362, 5401
War
Charities, 5490, 6062
Expenditure, 549
Supplies, munitions contracts, 5537
War-time Elections Bill, 5606, 5670, 5751, 5841
Wharves, 1945
Wheat, fixing of price of, 3694
Woman suffrage, 1516

McKenzie, Lieut. F. J. S., payments to, 986

McLean, Mr. Angus A. (Queen's, P.E.I.)
Prince Edward Island Railway, 3947
Pensions, 6013
Submarine situation, 1327

McLeod-Tellier Commission
Appointment of, 2056
Counsel, 3418
Expenses of, 5245

McLeod-Tellier Commission—*Con.*
Report of, 4291
Sittings of, 2322, 2357
See also Galt, Mr. Justice, *and* Landry, Mr. Justice

McMillan, Mr. John A. (Glengarry)
Cheese purchases by British Government, 1774
Dairying industry, 2256

McNab, Colin C., proposed allowance to, 578

McNeil, F. C., payments to, 1380

McNeil, Lt. John D., promotion of, 5272

McQueen, Lieut. W. A., employment of, 4508

McSpadden, Lt.-Col., position of, 2618

McWilliams, Mr., dismissal of, 2165

Magdalen Islands, cable service, 5407

Magladery, Mr. Thomas, M.L.A., position and pay of, 4685

Mails. *See* Post office

Manitoba, County Court judges, 5083

Maple sugar. *See* Food products

Marcil, Hon. Charles (Bonaventure)
Address in reply to the Governor General's Speech, 109, 119
Canada and the war, 109, 119
The Nationalist party, 109, 120
The Dorchester election, 111, 120
Recruiting in Quebec, 112, 119, 127
Quebec, past and present. 123
National service, 126
The high cost of living, 129
Army, Fifth Canadian Division, 459
Béland, Hon. Dr., M.P., 311, 341
Bonaventure
Breakwater, 988
County, mail service, 1126
Recruiting officer, 1675
Campbellton-Gaspe steamship service, 1126, 1228, 1959
Carleton Beach protection works, 1126
Civil Service, salaries, 2238
Court, Private Harry Ivan, 3295
Cross Point wharf, 988, 1228, 1571
Customs Department, dismissals from, 1844
Dagneau, John F., 1471
Daylight saving, 3685
Dorchester county election, 111, 120
Elaine, steamer, 1379
Gascons wharf, 2055
Gaspe steamship services, 2325
Government Railways Act amendment, 4343
Hopetown post office, 989, 1474
Interprovincial bridges, 3891
Intoxicating liquors, 2008
Le Blanc, Maurice, 1816

Marcil, Hon. C.—*Con.*
Marcil, Private Joseph, 893
Maria Beach protection works, 898
Matapedia public highway, 1379, 1816
Migratory birds, 3660
Miguasha wharf, 1126
Military service
Classes, 3354
Exceptions, 3564
Exemptions, 3219, 3307, 3364
Persons liable for service, 3129
Quebec situation, 2428, 3257. *See under this head,* Quebec
Referendum, 2432
Militia Department, employees, 312
Montreal, customs collectorship, 311
Nationalist party, 109, 120
New Carlisle, war expenditure in, 1575
New Richmond post office, 898
Overseas Military Forces, Minister of, 4209
Packages, marking of,—inspection and sale, 4067, 4070
Paspebiac wharf, 898, 988
Paspebiac-Hopetown mail service, 1126
Pratt Bros., payments to, 1570
Prisoners of war, exchange of, 341
Quebec and Oriental railway, 1674
Quebec, recruiting in, 112, 127, 213, 342, 2428
Railway Act, The, 3513
Read, Lance Corporal, 717
Renault, Raoul, appointment of, 2375
Restigouche river, bridging of, 988
Ross rifle, 422
Ruisseau le Blanc breakwater, 898
St. Charles de Caplan wharf, 898
Separation allowances, 386
Shigawake post office, 898
Shigawake East post office, 988
Shipbuilding, 1921, 1930
Soldier Settlement Board, 3626, 3789
Taxation, income, 4102, 4123, 4130
United States troops, training of in Canada, 2482
War-time Elections Bill, 5641, 5717, 5813
Wharves, 1944

Marcile, Mr. Joseph E. (Bagot)
Budget, 1292
Trade and financial conditions, 1293
The French-Canadian people, 1294
Recruiting, 1294
Transcontinental railway, 1295
Government appointments and dismissals, 1296
Canadian Northern Railway, acquisition of, 4998
House of Commons Accountant's office, lease of premises, 5703
Military Service Bill, 3053
Recruiting, 1294

Margaree harbour improvements, 3867, 5330

Maria Beach protection works, 898

Marine
- Coastal regulations, 1912
- Hospitals. *See that title*
- Icebreakers, 1818, 1836
- Insurance. *See that title*
- Life-saving, 1949
- Lighthouse and coast service
  - Agencies, 1936
  - Compressors, sale of, 4920
  - Lights, experiments with, 2173
  - Maintenance and repairs, 1940
  - Salaries, 1939, 3134, 6049
  - Signal service, 1942
- Maritime road repairs, 1815, 1947
- Minto, steamer, food supplies for, 2175
- Navigation
  - Aids to, 1940
  - Obstructions to, 1841
  - Schools, 1838
- Ocean and river service, contracts for provisions, 4923
- Pilotage, 4922, 6049
- Pilots' pensions, 1948
- St. Lawrence signal and telegraph service, 1471
- Shipbuilding, 242, 292, 703, 1325, 1342, 1551, 1556, 1565, 1566, 2293
  - Contracts by Imperial Munitions Board, 1371, 1661, 1663, 1913
  - Government aid to, 802, 1371
  - Government vessels, 1912
  - Vessels under construction, 665, 1666
  - Wooden, vessels, construction of, 1775, 1924
- Steamers, government
  - Construction, 1912
  - Maintenance and repairs, 1836
  - Revenue cruisers, 1881
- Steamship services. *See that title*
- Vessels
  - Commandeering of, 662, 1667
  - Government service, in, 1130
  - Investigations into, 1838
- Wharves, repairs to, 1943

Marine and Fisheries Department
- Appointments, 1937
- Estimates, 655, 1815, 1836, 1912, 4920, 6049
- Pictou agent, 1936
- Services of, 2027

Maritime Provinces
- Elections, 207
- Military affairs, 5226

Marlow, Lt.-Col. F. W., appointment of, 1227

Martell, Lieut. L. H., position and pay of, 5914

Martin, Mr. Méderic (Montreal, St. Mary's)
- Food control, 2094, 2097
- High cost of living, 708
- Letter carriers, salaries of, 580, 1474
- Military service, 2813
  - Amendments, 2820
  - Quebec situation, 2813
- Oleomargarine, 2202, 2283
- Soldiers, behaviour of at public gatherings, 5233
- Taxation, income of, 4127
- War-time Elections Bill, 3612

Matane harbour light, 1575

Matapedia public highway, 1379, 1816

Matheson post office, 3502

Matthews-Blackwell, Limited. *See* O'Connor

Matthews, Mr. L., 1228

Meat and Canned Foods Act Amendment Bill. Res., 2114. 1r., 2116. 2r., 2149. Ref., to Com., 2149. Com., 3400. 3r., 3401. Sen. amndts., 5425

Medicine Hat, military reserve, 301

Meighen, Hon. Arthur (Solicitor General)
(From p. 4926 Secretary of State and Minister of Mines.)
- Army
  - Desertions, 3111
  - Discharges, purchase of, 3112
  - Enlistment, 2530
- Budget, 845
  - Revenue and expenditure of Canada, 846
  - Fiscal policies, 848
  - Free wheat, 850
  - Amendment of Mr. Turriff, 859
- Canadian Northern Railway, acquisition of, 4257, 4264, 4580, 4597-4614, 4631, 4842, 5133
- Capital punishment, 619, 636
- Censorship
  - Censors and decoders, 576
  - "The Fiddlers," 5947
- Coalition government, 3732
- Companies Act amendment, 5918-5942
- Flour, price of, 1073
- Free wheat, 850
- McLeod-Tellier Commission, 5245, 5255
- Military service, 3237-3261
  - Appeals, 3175, 3301
  - Burden of proof, 3318
  - Classes, 3140
    - Calling out by, 3130, 3271
    - Division into, 3355
  - Contraventions of Act, 3325-3352, 3360, 3579
  - Exceptions, 3362-3371
  - Exemptions, 3130, 3188, 3196, 3205, 3211, 3219, 3272, 3303, 3362

Meighen, Hon. A.—*Con.*
Expenses, 3262, 3361
Labour, attitude of, 3732
Parliament, authority of, 2530
Penalties, 3271
Persons liable for service, 3116, 3125
Quebec situation, 2536
Referendum, 2533
Regulations, 3314
Tribunals, 3149, 3295, 3574
Passports for women, 5783
Press statements correction of, 4889
Provincial legislators, free transportation for, 685
Senate, appointments to, 926
Soldiers
Returned, appointment of to government positions, 6058
Votes for, 1390, 3730
Transcontinental railway—removal of rails to France, 1229, 1266
United Grain Growers, Limited, 894
War charities, 6062
War supplies, Ross rifle, 479, 493
War-time Elections Bill, 5582, 5637-5702, 5708-5771, 6076
Merritt, Col. W. H., collection by for Aviation Fund, 5362
Michaud, Mr. Pius (Victoria, N.B.),
Blain, Lieut. Roswell, 4245
Canadian Northern Railway, acquisition of, 5028
Civil Service promotions, 2021
Dalhousie militia buildings, 454
Danis, Joseph M., 2618
Farm labourers from United States, 4512
Immigration regulations, 454
Intercolonial railway, 798
Mail service, 3639
Military Service Bill, 2808
United States, head tax on foreigners entering, 1266
Middlebro, Mr. William S. (North Grey)
Army, soldiers' votes, 4894
Breidert and Mudge patents, 1199
Canadian Northern railway, acquisition of, 4512
Companies, incorporation of, 5939
Food control, 2509
Government Railways Act amendment, 4378
House of Commons—sessional indemnity of members, 6046
Military service, 2502
Exemptions, 2506, 3202
Parliament authority of, 2503
Provinces, recruiting by, 2511
Referendum, 2502, 2512
Pensions, 6010
Soldier Settlement Board, 3624

Middlebro, Mr. W. S.—*Con.*
Taxation
Business profits, 2508
Wealth, 2507
Income, 4073, 4106
Migratory Birds Convention Bill. 1r., 2525. 2r., 3657. Com., 3657. 3r., 3662
Miguasha wharf, 1126
Military
Bands, 4044
Districts
Nos. 3 and 10, 455
No. 6, Halifax, Capt. R. V. Harris, 5422
Officers, 5226, 5236, 5422
Forces
Overseas, Minister of, 4195, 4417, 4441
Administration of, 4200
Hospitals. *See that title*
Trains, 2205
Military and Naval Aid Bill ($500,000,000). *See* War Appropriation
Military Hospitals Commission, 464, 473, 4243
See also Canadian Army Medical Service *and* Hospitals
Military Service. *See also* Army *and* Conscription
Appeals, 3175
Army Act, provisions of, 3111
Authority of Parliament, 2392, 2419, 2435, 2465, 2530, 2539, 2622, 2632, 2643, 2669, 2743, 2848, 2851, 2911, 3031, 3723
Available men, 2390, 2439, 2455, 2551, 3049, 3255, 3371
Board of selection, 2954, 5083, 5474
Burden of proof, 3318
Certificates, 3261
Classes
Calling out by, 3130, 3138, 3272
Division into, 3353
Contraventions of Act, 3324, 3360, 3579
Correspondence between Prime Minister and ex-Minister of Militia, 2434, 2446, 3086
Council, 5314
Enforcement, 2416, 2545, 2560, 2681, 2744, 2780, 3262
Examiners, medical, 6069
Exceptions, 3269, 3362, 3559
Exemptions, 2607, 2624, 2806, 2955, 3043, 3130, 3187, 3272, 3303, 3362 5417, 6002, 6068
See also under this title Classes *and* Persons liable for service
Expenses, 3262, 3361
Great Britain, military service in, 2908
Industrial requirements, 2441, 2579, 2798, 3020
See also Labour

Military Service—*Con.*
Insurance premiums of soldiers, 3557, 3589
Labour, attitude of. *See* Labour
Medically unfit persons, certificates to, 5423
Penalties, 3271. *See under this title,* Classes
Persons liable for service, 3116
Quebec Province, relation to, 2398, 2424, 2428, 2473, 2515, 2536, 2543, 2549, 2602, 2626, 2638, 2659, 2685, 2697, 2704, 2716, 2728, 2736, 2748, 2754, 2784, 2792, 2812, 2828, 2841, 2852, 2866, 2898, 2926, 2959, 2965, 2998, 3005, 3017, 3037, 3257, 3255
See also Quebec
Referendum proposed, 2403, 2478, 2498, 2521, 2527, 2533, 2555, 2582, 2589, 2601, 2623, 2632, 2651, 2659, 2665, 2670, 2713, 2729, 2736, 2787, 2849, 2858, 2860, 2882, 2889, 2894, 2900, 2961, 3013, 3028, 3046, 3721, 3728, 3730
Registrars, 3174, 5900
Regulations, 3235, 3314
Selective draft features, 2438, 2458, 2910, 2954
See also, under this title, Board of Selection
Tribunals, 3149, 3295, 3301, 3574, 5881
Location of, 4193

Military Service Bill, 1917. 1r., 2184. 2r., 2390, 2434, 2458, 2483, 2526, 2571, 2592, 2654, 2709, 2777, 2833, 2881, 2903, 2944, 2947, 3004. Div., 3085. Com., 3086, 3110, 3135, 3187, 3237, 3295, 3353, 3375, 3554, 3557. 3r., 3718. Sen. amdts., 4663
Amendments proposed
Sir Wilfrid Laurier, 2403; lost on div., 3074
Mr. Barrette, 2524. Point of order respecting, 2844; Committee of inquiry into, 2880, 2944. Lost on div., 3074
Mr. Copp, 3075; lost on div., 3084

Military Service Council, 5314

Military Voters' Bill, 1917. 1r., 4406. 2r., 4688. Com., 4693, 4740, 4792, 4874, 4889. 3r., 5086, 5195
Amendments proposed: Mr. Pugsley, (1) 4762; lost on div., 4774. (2) 4892; lost on div., 4907. Mr. German, 4907; lost on div., 4909. Sen. amdts., 5956

Militia and Defence
Department
Administration of, 82, 287
Automobiles, 2525, 3903
Employees, 312
Estimates, staff and salaries, 3949, 3962, 4044, 5218
Drill halls, control of, 4146

Militia and Defence—*Con.*
Ex-Minister of,
Charges by, 226, 234
Resignation of, 164, 287
Correspondence relating to resignation of, 991
Headquarters staff at Halifax, 5226
Home defence, 336, 359, 1038, 2628, 3955
Officers, recruiting of, 3134
Military buildings, inspector of, 1039
Overseas Minister of. *See* Overseas Forces
Permanent force, 4055
Princess Louise Fusiliers, officers of, at Halifax, 5271

Mill feeds. *See* Grain

Milsom, Major J. C., inquiry into conduct of, 1265

Mines and Minerals
Department estimates, 657, 4179, 5780
Ministry of, proposed, 2007
Smelting, provision for, 66
Zinc, bounties on, 2330
See also Fuel

Minister of the Overseas Military Forces, the Parliamentary Secretary of the Department of Militia and Defence, and the Parliamentary Under-Secretary of State for External Affairs Bill. Res., 4195. 1r., 4215. 2r., 4417. Com., 4441. 3r., 4661
Amendments proposed: Mr. Lemieux, 4448; lost on div., 4449. Mr. Proulx, 4453; lost on div., 4453
See also Parliamentary Secretaryships

Mint, Royal, Ottawa Branch, 1474

Mitchell, Private J. F., death of, 1377

Moffat, Lieut. R. J., expenses of, 5361

Molloy, Mr. John P. (Provencher)
Army allowances, 3082
Kelly, Thomas, treatment of, 896
Loans to farmers, 1964
Military Service, 3082
Railway mail clerks, 4102
Tariff revision, 1776

Moncton
Armoury site, 4787

Mondou, Mr. A. A. (Yamaska)
Military service, 2989
Montreal Gazette, statement of, 3004

Montreal
Contributions to the war, 249
Customs collectorship, 311, 648
Immigration agents, 5122
Inland Revenue officials at, 758

Montreal—*Con.*
Postmaster, 523, 581
Post office sub-station, 596
Public building, 305

Montreal Trades and Labour Council, 2198

Monuments, erection of, 3896, 3899

Moore, Major Rev. A. H., 1265

Moosejaw
Enlistments, 5122

Moosejaw News patronage, 2708

Morphy, Mr. H. B. (North Perth)
Army
Soldiers, voting of, 4701, 4756, 4786, 4815, 4900
Cheese manufacture, regulations, 2265
Civil Service salaries, 2013
Companies, incorporation of, 5941
Criminal Code amendments, jurors, 4299, 4324
Gordon Divorce Bill, 5906
Insurance, 5196
Live Stock and Produce Bill, 4290, 5505, 5513
Military service
Classes, 3142, 3284, 3291
Exemptions, 3193, 3364
Persons liable for service, 3118
National Gallery of Canada, 5301
Pensions, 6010
Telegraph and telephone lines, 5378

Morris, Mr. James (Chateauguay)
Budget, 973
Nationalist party, 974
Free wheat, 975
The record of the Government, 975
Military Service, 2978
Newspaper article, correction of, 1775
Woman suffrage, 1523

Morton, Dr. A., position of, 5706, 5913

Mounted Police
See Royal Northwest

Mount Royal Tunnel and Terminal, 4835

Maxom, Major, position of, 4415

Muchaboom wharf, 304

Murphy, Hon. Charles (Russell)
Address in reply to the Governor General's Speech, 225
Proposed committee of inquiry, 225
Charges by ex-Minister of Militia, 226
Army medical service, 227
The Ross rifle, 228
Armstrong, S. A., 802

Murphy, Hon. C.—*Con.*
Army
Medical service, 227, 3978
Overseas forces, proposed holiday for, 5902
Rejected men, 3100
Soldiers, voting of, 4760, 4812, 4890
Baugh, Edward Levi, 1470, 2481
Canada Gazette, publication of, 3738
Canadian Northern railway acquisition of, 4593-4608, 4637, 4972
Cheese purchases by British Government, 1863, 2197
Civil Service appointments, 643, 648, 2021, 2238
Under Order in Council of Jan. 1, 1917, 3003
Promotions, 4666
Firearms in Quebec hardware stores, 5083
Flour, alleged profit on, 5085
Georgian Bay Canal Commission, 3901
Hospital on Parliament Hill, 1228
Inland Revenue Department, estimates, 2388
Latchford, Ont., plant and buildings, sale of, 5706
Lessard, General, 365
Marlowe, Lt.-Col. F. W., 1227
McLeod-Tellier Commission, 5251
McSpadden, Lt.-Col., 2618
Military Service, 2538
Enforcement, 2545
Labour, attitude of, 2543
Quebec, attitude of, 2543
Senate amendments, 4665
Montreal
Post office sub-station, 596
Public building, 305
Monuments, erection of, 3900
Ottawa, government land in, 1130
Parliament buildings
Brick for, 337
Contract for construction of, 454
Stone for, 304
Parliamentary secretaryships, 4213
Public Works Department architect, 5104
Recruiting of British subjects in United States, 2482
Rideau canal, lighting of, 1939
Ross rifle, 228, 421
Substitute for, 1012, 1594
Valuation of factory, 1265
Taxation, income, 4131, 4649
War supplies, clothing, 3556
War-time Elections Bill, 5618, 5656, 5669, 5732, 5764

Murray Bay railway service, 617

National Battlefields Commission, 2061

National Gallery of Canada, 3398, 5301

National Government, 132, 136, 161, 177
See Coalition

National Organization for War, pamphlet, 4685

National Service, 71, 93, 126, 170, 191
Cards, 2479
Distribution and return of, 361, 667, 713, 1376
Effect of on recruiting, 361, 374
Commission, 64, 200
Employes of military age, 4787
Expenditure, 3676
Officials, 309, 376, 3676
Purpose of, 370, 2413
Statement by the Director General, 6086

National Trust Company, 4417, 4685

National Transcontinental Railway. *See* Canadian Government railways

Nationalist party, 109, 120, 143, 179, 1224
Statement by Prime Minister, 4564

Naturalization Acts, administration of, 3741

Naval Service
Department
Estimates, staff and salaries, 660, 4157
Statement by the Minister, 4157
Grilse, H.M.C.S., command of, 4563
H.M.C.S. Niobe and Rainbow, 4162
Life saving, 661
Master mariners at Halifax, 4416
Officers at Halifax, 6000
Patrol service, 4163, 4164, 4170, 5243, 5274
Recruiting for British Admiralty, 4159
Transport service, 4161
Wilfrid C., vessel, 4062
See Air Service

Niobe
See Naval Service

Neely, Mr. D. B. (Humboldt)
McInnes, M. A., 5422
Military Service Bill, 2778
Sifton, Sir Clifford, statement of, reply to, 5774
Tariff revision, 1730
Taxation, farm implements, 1730
War-time Elections Bill, 5587, 5643-5652, 5724, 5821
White, Rev. Ward, 3903

Neely, Captain D. B., M.P., position and pay of, 6066

Neilly, Dr., military position of, 2707

Nesbitt, Mr. Edward W. (North Oxford)
Address in reply to the Governor General's Speech, 94
Canadian troops at the front, 95

Nesbitt, Mr. E. W.—*Con.*
Economy in government expenditure, 95
Camp Borden, 96, 100
National Service cards, 96
Expenditure on public works, 97
Political patronage, 97
Military officers, 98
Recruiting, 98
Army
Medical service, 542
Soldiers
Pay, 3216, 5223
Voting, 4705, 4769, 5196
Bran, prices of, 4466
Brantford moulders' strike, 2322
Canadian Northern railway, acquisition of, 4501, 4609, 4632, 5131
Cattle, British embargo on, 920
Cheese purchases, 2197, 2258
Cold storage, 2255
Criminal Code Amendment, proposed, 1677
Daylight saving, 3684
Farm labour, 3510
Government Railway Act amendment, 4346
Grain for breweries and distilleries, 1179
Insurance, 3850, 5200
Live stock exchanges, 4289, 5503
Loans, public, 347
Military Service
Classes, 3143
Exemptions, 3211, 3216, 3272
Quebec situation, 2594
Voluntary enlistment, 2592
O'Connor, Mr. W. F., report of, 3747
Overseas Military Forces, Minister of, 4208
Penitentiaries, 6036
Pensions, 6016
Political patronage, 97
Potatoes, 1437
Quebec railways, 5463
Railway Act, The, 3520, 3530
St. John harbour works, 5895
Scientific and industrial research, 3911
Taxation
Business profits, 1436, 1445, 1654
Wealth, 2597
Telegraph and telephones lines, 5400
Tractor engines, duty on, 677
United Grain Growers, Limited, 895
War charities, 5481
War expenditure, 541

New Brunswick Public Works. *See* Public Works

New Carlisle, war expenditure in, 1575

New Glasgow-Mountville mail service, 1037

New Hamburg postmaster, 6053

New Richmond West post office, 898

Newsprint paper, 757, 1464, 1645
See Pulp and paper

Nicholson, Mr. Donald (Queen's, P.E.I.)
Address in reply to the Governor General's Speech, 238
Canada under Conservative rule, 238
Enlistments from Prince Edward Island, 241
Prosperity of Canada, 241, 243
Shipbuilding, 242
The French-Canadian people, 243
Military Service, 3001

Nickerson, W. H., dismissal of, 1472

Nickerson, William C., employment of, 2283

Nickle, Mr. W. F. (Kingston)
Army
Camps, sale of liquor in, 833
Forestry battalions, 3951
Pensions, 1615
Canadian Northern railway acquisition of, 4587
Civil Service salaries, 2250
Industrial and scientific research, 5284
Military Hospitals Commission, 473
Military Service
Classes, 3290
Exemptions, 3203
Packages, marking of—inspection and sale, 4066
Penitentiaries, officials, 6037
Pensions, 6011, 6033
Quebec railways, 5462
Railway Act, The, 3532, 3540, 3604, 3608
Royal Military College, 5310
Senate, proposed change in constitution of, 1141
Separation allowances, 382
Soldiers, returned, care of, 472
Taxation, income, 4074, 4107
Toronto, Hamilton and Buffalo railway, 2611
War charities, 5488
War-time Elections Bill, 5753, 5837

Nixon, Mr. A. W., military position of, 6067

Non-support
See Criminal Code Amendment Bills

North Battleford, government employees, 453

Northrup, Mr. W. B. (East Hastings)
Gordon Divorce Bill, 5497, 5904
Grain for breweries and distilleries, 1184
Parliamentary sessions, expense of, 1261, 2524
Racing meets, limitation of, 321

North Sydney customs service, 607, 1852

Northwest Game Bill, The. 1r., 2569. 2r., 3665. Com., 2665, 4659. 3r., 4661

Nova Scotia
Electoral lists, 6068
Judge for district No. 6, 6003
Patrol service, 5423
Public works. *See* Public works

Ocean Telegraph Act Repeal Bill. Res., 2024. 1r., 2026. 2r., 2108. Rep., 2114. 3r., 2137

O'Connor, Mr. W. F., K.C. *See* Food: Investigation

Officers. *See* Army

Ogilvie Flour Mills Co., earnings and taxes of, 198, 1818, 2389, 3677

Oil, bounties, 2329

Oil-boring machinery, 301

Oleomargarine, 304, 2202
Resolution of Montreal Labour Club, 2283

Oliver, Hon. Frank (Edmonton)
Address in reply to the Governor General's Speech, 67
Our obligations in the war, 68
Recruiting, 69-77
National service, 71
The present Administration and the war, 77
Aliens, homestead rights of, 3808
Army
Allowances, 3079
Enlistment
Alberta, in, 3373, 3375
Retarding of, 2411-2415
Unfit men, of, 4003
See, under this head, Recruiting
Expeditionary force, 1816
Forestry battalions, 3951
Medical service, 3975
Officers, salutes to, 5425
Pensions, 384
Recruiting, 69
Edmonton, in, 366, 3371, 3375
Expenses, 1959
Government, 3371
Unfit men, 3107
United States, in, 3759
See, under this head, Enlistment
Soldiers
Pensions, 1603, 4051
Returned, care of, 474
Separation allowances, 383, 387
Voting of, 4791, 4812, 4892-4914
Widows of, 3806
Binder twine, 2333
British Cattle Supply Company, 1817
Bruce, Dr., report of, 1343, 1525

Oliver, Hon. F.—*Con.*
Canada Year Book, 2337
Canadian Government railways, rolling stock, 4930
Canadian Northern railway, acquisition of, 4304, 4505, 4610-4619, 5180
Capital punishment, 630
Cloakey, George, 1819
Coal, western mining of, 2200, 2238, 2525, 2653, 2776
Cold storage, 2259
Conscription, statement in L'Evenement, 434
Customs Tariff Act, proposed amendment, 1685, 1689, 1727, 1776
Dominion Lands officials, 1675
Dominion Lands Act amendment, 3793-3812
Drake, steamer, 4245
Edmonton railway bridge, 3892
Edson, town of, 1816
Elevators *See, under this title,* Grain
Experimental stations, 2065
Fiddlers, the. *See, under this title,* "The Fiddlers"
Fisheries, Lac la Biche, 2158
Flour, 5209, 5212
Sales between Canada and United States, 5273
Free food, proposed amendment, 1686
Food control, 2081
Freight rates, 3715
Game in the Northwest, 3665
Government employees, political activity of, 2349
Grain
Board of Supervisors, 3697
Elevators, 2334
Transportation of, 1681, 3396, 3412, 3712
Wheat
Export, prohibition of, 3882
Prices and control, 3690, 4512, 4661, 4687, 4887, 5209, 6000
Grande Prairie immigration hall, 1575
Grey, Ambrose, 1818
Homestead regulations, 1747
Homesteaders, names of, 1819
House of Commons
Estimates, 2359
Sessional indemnity of Members, 6047
Howe, Lt. M. J., 6066
Hudson Bay railway, 5092
Immigration, 1764, 2140, 2148
United States, from, 1747
Indians
Kitsilano reserve, 1899
Lands, 1888
Okanagan reserve, 1378, 2341
Industrial and scientific research, 5280

Oliver, Hon. F.—*Con.*
Inland Revenue Department officials and expenditure, 2362, 2380-2387
Intercolonial railway, rails, 1575
Interior Department employees, 1344, 2349
Live stock
Exchanges, 5508
Improvement of, 2278, 2281
Mail service, 3638
Merritt, Col.—Aviation Fund, 5362
Military service
Authority of Parliament, 2419
Available men, 3371
Burden of proof, 3322
Classes, 3358
Contraventions of Act, 3328, 3351, 3360, 3579
Enforcement, 2416
Exemptions, 3195, 3227, 3234, 3311, 3364
General provisions, 2411, 3238
Mounted Police, Royal Northwest, 301, 335, 4674
National service, 71, 361, 370, 374, 2413
National Transcontinental railway, 2209, 2218
North Battleford government employees 453
O'Connor, Mr. W. F., report of, 3938
Oil bounties, 2329
Parliament, extension of term of, 3496
Patriotic Fund, 3079
Penitentiaries—officials' salaries, 6043
Pensions, 6005-6033
Poplar trees, conservation of, 3742
Public buildings
Construction, 4181
Rentals, 4149, 5097
Repairs, 5106, 5304
Telephone service, 4147
Quebec and Saguenay railway, 1575
Railway material, removal of to France, 301, 310, 1473-1474, 1615, 1628, 1820, 3407-3408, 3398, 5293
Railways
Expenditure on, 2233
Operation of, 3412
Transportation of coal by, 3395
Recruiting. *See, under this title,* Army
Rogers, Lt.-Col. Maynard, 1818
Ross rifle, 427, 432, 478, 510
Shore, George, suspension of sentence on, 1373
Soldier Settlement Board, 2780, 3625
Tariff revision, 1776
Taxation, 1677
Income, 4644
Telegraph and telephone lines, 3893, 5389

Oliver, Hon. F.—*Con.*
"The Fiddlers" forbidden circulation, 3503. 3654, 3881, 5942. 5944
War
Charities, 3489
Government, administration of, 3371
Munitions contracts, 5532
War-time Elections Bill, 5553, 5638-5702, 5816
Ways and Means—amendment to motion for second reading of resolutions, 1677
Yukon
Judges' salaries, 5897
Miners' strike, 3086
Prices and cost of living, 2199, 2237, 2481, 2525, 2945

Orangemen. *See* Loyal Orange Order

Ottawa
Government land in, 1130
Rents paid by the Government in, 4149, 5097

Outlook Publishing Company, payments to, 607

Overseas Minister of Munitions. *See* War

Overseas Forces, Minister of the, 5
Non-combatant employees of Department, 4786
See Minister of the Overseas Forces, etc., Bill

Overseas forces. *See* Army.

Pacaud, Mr. Lucien T. (Megantic)
Military Service Bill, 2916
Thetford mines labour trouble, 1113

Pacific Dredging Company, 1126

Packages, marking of. *See* Inspection and Sale Act Amendment Bill

Palmerston post office building, 1127

Papineau, Mr. Louis J. (Beauharnois)
Lefebvre, Major Alfred, 1037, 2618, 2003
Military service, 2997

Paquet, Mr. Eugène (L'Islet)
Budget, 1297
Union and solidarity of the Canadian people, 1297
The financial position of Canada, 1298
Munitions manufacture, 1299
Development of agriculture, 1300
Food products, imports and exports of, 1573
Immigration, 803
Military service, 2789
Public health, 992
Repatriation of Canadians, 803

Pardee, Mr. Frederick F. (West Lambton)
Army
Camps, sale of liquor in, 823
Enlistments, 1125
Medical service, 3971

Pardee, Mr. F. F.—*Con.*
Budget, 1304
Investigation into cost of foodstuffs, 1304
Plea for better Canadianism, 1307
Canadian Northern railway, acquisition of, 5136
Drawbacks, payments of, 1818
Food products, control of, 1304
Georgian Bay Canal Commission, 452
Home Defence Force, 1038
Judges on provincial commissions, 593
Lavergne, Mr. Armand, 1038
Lewis machine guns, 2201
Mackenzie, Lieut. F. J. S., 986
Military service
Exemptions, 3191
Personal attitude respecting, 3721
Persons liable for service, 3127
Tribunals, 3163
National Gallery, 5303
National Service cards, 1376
New Hamburg postmaster, 6053
Parliament, extension of term of, 3481
Pensions, 6007
Post office employees—salaries, 6051, 6053
Returned soldiers, 459
Shipbuilding at Prince Rupert, 4787
Taxation
Income, 4118, 4638
Wealth, 2528
Traction engines, duty on, 680
War-time Elections Act—tribunals, 6070

Paris, Ontario, recruiting in, 601

Parker, Mr. R. G. M., salary and position of, 2201

Parks, Canadian National; Jasper, 1477

Parliament
Adjournment of—Imperial War Conference, 117
Extension of term of, 15, 37, 157, 172, 175, 189, 223, 293, 2396, 3419.
Address to His Majesty the King, 3453, 3475; Div., 3501
Proposed amendment of Mr. Graham, 3461; Div., 3483
Statement by Prime Minister—no action, 3504
Members
Military pay of, 713
Railway transportation for, 3519
Printing of, 2007, 5901
Report of Committee on, 5949
Sessions—expense of
Motion for Committee to consider, 1261
Committee appointed, 1568
Joint action with Senate proposed, 2024
Reports, 2524, 5636

Parliament Buildings
New
Brick for, 337
Construction of, 454, 4181
Marble for, 2833
Stone for, 304
Old—destruction of—indemnities for losses, 4413

Parliamentary Procedure
Adjournment motion for discussion of definite matter of urgent public importance
Discussion closely limited, 1176
When allowable, 5517, 5547
Appeal from ruling of Chairman, 2366
Bills
Discussion on introduction of, 4410
Discussion of subsequent to amendments being reported from Committee, 5771
Printing of in both languages, 5550, 5559
Sections allowed to stand not debatable, 4752
Censored publications, quotation from in Parliament, 5492
Closure
Applied
Canadian Northern Railway Bill, notice, 5121; carried, 5123
War-time Elections Bill. 2r., 5565, 5566. 3r., 5806
Concurrence in resolution of Committee of Supply not debatable, 5095
See Speaker
Rules of debate under, 5002, 5015, 5121, 5123, 5565
Committee of Supply
Application of rule 17c to Saturday sittings of, 5891, 5901
Procedure in discussing items of which votes are made up, 4947
See, under this head, Concurrence
Committee of Ways and Means amendments when in order
Moved, 478
Chairman's ruling, 521
Resolutions from, amendment to second reading must be relevant, 1686
Concurrence in resolution of Committee of Supply—form of notice, 5095
Irrelevancy, 2362, 2374, 5235, 5237
Language reflecting on the Chair, 2567, 2609
Letter read in violation of rules of the House, not printed, 3956
Motions, debatable, 5094
Motion for delay, Speaker's ruling, 3078
Order of business, 5891, 5901

Parliamentary Procedure,—*Con.*
Order of the day lapsed for want of a quorum, reinstatement of, 2877
Orders of the Day—motion to read, 5703
Petitions, form for presentation of, 2284
Privilege—statement of member, how limited, 599
For Privilege, *see that title*
Questions
Answers to, discussions on, 4959
Not in proper form, 4834
Receiving report of Committee of Supply—form of notice, 5095
Saturday sittings, Committe of Supply, how constituted in, 5890
Senate
Regularity of its proceedings not to be questioned in House of Commons, 5498
Taxation measure amended by, 5480, 5883
Sitting of House suspended, 1766
Taxation exclusive rights of House of Commons over, 5480, 5883
Votes and Proceedings, correctness of entry in, Committee to inquire into appointed, 2880. Report of, 2944

Parliamentary Secretaryships, 5
See Minister of the Overseas Forces, etc., Bill

Paspebiac wharf, 898, 988

Paspebiac-Hopetown mail service, 1126

Passports, Atlantic, for women, 3996, 5783

Patenaude, Hon. Esioff L. (Secretary of State)
Post Office Department estimates, 660
Resignation of office, 2199, 2235
Correspondence with Prime Minister, 2494
Secretary of State Department, of the, estimates, 655
Victoria bridge toll rates, 672

Patent medicines, 1470
Classification of, 335
Controller of, resigns, 986
Legislation, inquiry as to proposed, 985
Regulations governing, 3817

Patent Record, printing of, 2062

Patriotic Fund. *See* Canadian Patriotic Fund

Patronage. *See* Political

Pay and Records Office, 3104

Payne, Mr., employment of, 5272

Peace
Dominions, consultation with on, 300
Proposals
President Wilson's, 103
Rumoured, 4466

Peat, 1405, 1422

Pelagie Sealing Treaty, claims under, 5958

Penitentaries
Dorchester, 1813
Meat supplies for, 337
Guards, salaries, of, 5803
Kelly, Thomas, treatment of, 1813
See Kelly
Officials, salaries of, 5898, 6033
Portsmouth, 3418
Prisoners
Enlistment of, proposed, 1012, 1814
Labour of, 6036, 6040
Release of, for work on farms, 803
Report of inspector, 3419

Pennsylvania coal, embargo on, 2199

Penny Bank Act Amendment Bill. 1r., 1773. 2r., Com., 3r., 2059

Pensions
Military, 1594
Amount required for, 5899
Board of Commissioners and staff, 608, 4176, 4958
Canadian in Imperial forces, for, 4662, 4688
Dependents of soldiers, 4051
Erroneous announcement denied, 5423
European war, 6005
Militiamen, 6004
Patriotic Fund, agents in applications, 382
Proposed bill, 845
Inquiry concerning, 4293
Revision of scale, 5424
Naval, pilots, 6049
Royal Northwest Mounted Police, 5704

Perley, Sir George Halsey
Appointment as Minister of the Overseas Forces, 5

Petroleum. *See* Oil

Pictou (County)
Rural mail routes, 900

Pictou (Town)
Contractors for war supplies at, 303
Freight, handling of, at, 303
Marine and Fisheries agency, 304, 596, 1936

Plaxton, Mr. Charles P., position of, 4416

Point Tupper mail service, 3502

Political deadlock, rumoured, 1971

Political meetings, attendance of soldiers at, 4338

Political patronage, 203, 205, 287, 726
Recruiting, in, 86, 97, 154, 162

Pollution of streams, 454

Pommeroy, Mr. Samuel, position of, 4952

Poplar trees, utilization of, 3742

Port Hood wharf, 5336

Port Malcolm wharf, 3866

Post Office
Country postmasters, salaries of, 3634, 3642
Department
Estimates, 660, 2352, 2360, 3633, 5898, 6051
Staff and salaries, 660, 3633, 5898, 6051
Letter carriers, salaries of, 580, 1474, 1805, 2244
Mail carriers, 2243-4, 2708
Mail clerks, French-speaking, 5272
Mail contracts, 3635
Mail matter for soldiers, 3644
Mails, misuse of, 893, 1027
Parcel post, 2072, 3634, 3639
Prisoners of war, to, 3958
Postal clerks salaries, of, 2708, 3639
Railway mail service, 2244, 3650, 4102, 6051
Registration of mail matter, 668
Rural mail service, 3634, 5898
Carriers, 2247, 3634, 3636, 3643
Routes, number of, 2247
Signs, printing of, in French and English, 5999

Potatoes. *See* Agriculture *and* Food products

Power, Mr. William (Quebec, West)
Military Service, 2805

Pratt Brothers, payments to, 1570

Press censorship, 3503, 3654, 3718, 3881, 3995, 4059

Prices, fixing of. *See* Criminal Code Amendment Bills, Food *and* Cold storage

Prince Edward Island
Car ferry, 2205, 2304
See also Steamship services
Enlistments from, 241, 4563
Freight, handling of, 1037
Military organization, 5422
Payments to under Agricultural Instruction Act, 455
Public works. *See that title*
Steamship service, 660, 3389

Prince Edward Island Railway. *See* Canadian Government railways

Prince Rupert, shipbuilding at, 4787

Princess Louise Fusiliers, 5271

Printing, Government, 3737

Prison Labour, utilization of, 6036, 6040

Prisoners. *See* Penitentaries *and* War

Private Bills, discussed
Aerial League of the British Empire, 3633
Alliance Nationale, 1547
Bishop of Mackenzie River, 868
Breidert and Mudge Patents, 1199
Canadian Association of Stationary Engineers, 1198
Cascade Scenic Railway Company, 4365
Gordon Divorce Bill, 5496, 5541, 5902
Grain Growers Grain Co., Ltd., 1110
Grand Trunk Pacific Branch Lines Company, 1373
Imperial Order Daughters of the Empire and the Children of the Empire (Junior Branch), 5495
Mount Royal Tunnel and Terminal Co., 1110
Toronto, Hamilton and Buffalo railway, 2590, 2609, 3865, 3955, 3980
United Grain Growers Limited, 893

Privilege, questions of
Barrette, Mr.—statement in Halifax Chronicle, 3352
Blondin, Hon. P. E.—statement in Ottawa Evening Journal, 339
Boulay, Mr.—statement in Ottawa Citizen, 2776
Bureau, Mr.—statements in Montreal Gazette, 2709, 4730
Burnham, Mr.—correction of remarks in Hansard, 869
Clark, Mr. Michael—statements in the press, 3617
Descarries, Mr.—vote on Military Service Bill, 3846
Graham, Mr.—statement of Mr. R. B. Bennett, 804, 869
Hazen, Mr.—statement by Mr. Pugsley, 5274
Hughes, Sir Sam
Statement of Mr. Mark Irish, 2707
Statement of Mr. A. K. Maclean, 2777
Statement of Mr. Currie, 5773
Knowles, Mr.—statement in Toronto Telegram, 5085
Lafortune, Mr.—Ottawa Journal-Press, 3085
Laurier, Sir Wilfrid—statement of Sir Clifford Sifton, 4009
MacNutt, Mr.—Ottawa Journal-Press, 3656
Mondou, Mr.—statement in Montreal Gazette, 3004
Neely, Mr.—statement by Sir Clifford Sifton, 5774
Oliver, Hon. Frank—statement in L'Evenement, 434
Pugsley, Hon. William
Mr. Justice Landry, 3109
Statements of the Prime Minister, 3609

Privilege, question of—*Con.*
Statement in Toronto Star, 4959
Newspaper reports, 5273
Rogers, Hon. Robert—Ottawa Citizen editorial, 599
Sévigny, Hon. Albert—statement in Montreal Gazette, 2058
Sinclair, Mr.—statements in Ottawa Journal, 4927
Taylor, Mr. J. D.—remarks of Mr. Thomson, 1370
White, Sir Thomas—Toronto Globe editorial, 2707
Wilcox, Mr.—statement in Toronto Globe, 47

Prohibition or Restriction of the sale and use of Intoxicating Liquors Act Amendment Bill. 1r., 4192. 2r., com., 4395. 3r., 4405, *See also* Intoxicating liquors, Canada Temperance Act *and* Provincial prohibitory legislation

Proportional representation, 902

Proulx, Mr. Edmond (Prescott)
Boyce, George H., 1472
Canadian Association of Returned Soldiers, 4951
Canadian Northern railway, acquisition of, 5075
Cox, John, 1472
Criminal Code amendments, jurors, 4305
Customs Department, motor car for, 1476
Dillon, Major G. P., 1958
Georgian Bay Canal Commission, 5913
Gibson, Lieut. Wm., 5422
Grain for breweries and distilleries, 1179
Grilse, steamer, 4563
Hants county apple inspectors, 1380
Harris, Capt. R. V., 5422
Hughes, Brig.-Gen. W. S., 5361
Interprovincial bridges, 3890
Jaffray, Mr. J. P., 4062
Knight, Mr. N. H. R., 4952
Laurentian, steamer, 4563
Macpherson, Capt. Kenneth C., 4292, 4416, 4685
Magladery, Mr. Thomas, 4685
Military service, 3056
Exceptions, 3563
Exemptions, 3189, 3192, 3366
Militia Department automobiles, 3903
National Organization for War, 4685
Nixon, Mr. A. W., 6067
Overseas Military Forces, Minister of, 4431, 4449
Pensions, 6005
Quebec railways, 5474
Salter, R. J., 1472
Senate, the, proposed change in constitution of, 1144

Proulx, Mr. E.—*Con.*
Spence, Andrew, 1472
Steamer C. E. Tanner, 5362
Taylor, Lt.-Col. J. D. M.P., 986
Tremain, Lieut.-Col. H. B., M.P., 608, 1472
War supplies—hay, 338
War-time Elections Bill, 5623, 5669, 5829
Webb, Lieutenant, 4563
Wood, Lieutenant, 4563

Provincial governments, duties payable by, 2119, 2129

Provincial prohibitory legislation. Bill in aid of, 1r., 4192; 2r. and Com., 4395; 3r., 4405; Senate amendments, 5514
See also Intoxicating liquors, Prohibition *and* Canada Temperance Act

Public health, proposed department of, 992

Public Service Committee, recommendations of, 3633

Public Service Loan Bill. Res., 242. 1r., 353. 2r., 435. Com., 435. 3r., 476

Public Works
Buildings
Alberta, 5312
British Columbia, 1126, 5312
Generally, 4147, 5314
Manitoba, 5311
Nova Scotia, 4145
Ontario, 4146, 5309, 5412. *See* Ottawa
Quebec, 1935, 4145, 5309
Saskatchewan, 4146, 5312
Department
Automobile, purchase of, 2480
Estimates, 652, 1935, 3867, 3882, 4145, 4181, 5096, 5304, 5314, 5362
Staff and salaries, 3893, 5104
Dredging
British Columbia, 5359
Dredge Cape Breton, loss of, 596, 668, 1024, 3881
Dredge No. 6, 5404
Generally, 5096
Manitoba, Saskatchewan and Alberta, 3887
Maritime Provinces, 5359
Ontario and Quebec, 3886, 5359
See, under this title, Harbours and Rivers
Dry docks. *See* Dry Docks Subsidies Act Amendment Bill
Expenditure 1916-17, 1038
Harbours and Rivers
British Columbia, 3885, 5304, 5357
Manitoba, 5356
New Brunswick, 3872, 4185, 5347, 5411, 5890
Nova Scotia, 3866, 5314

Public Works—*Con.*
Ontario, 3883, 5355
Prince Edward Island, 3871
Quebec, 3879, 5353
See Quebec Harbour Advances Bill
Saskatchewan and Alberta, 3884
See, under this title, Dredging
Roads and bridges, 3888, 5360
Wharves, 1943

Publication Committee, 5791

Pugsley, Hon. William (St. John City)
Address in reply to the Governor General's Speech, 286
The political situation, 286
Returned soldiers and political patronage, 287
Administration of military affairs under late Minister of Militia, 287
Utilization of our natural resources, 291
Shipbuilding, 292
The Dorchester campaign, 293
Canada's naval policies, 293
Extension of term of Parliament, 293
Imperial War Conference, 294
Army
Desertions, 3111
Discharges, purchase of, 3112
Enlistments, 2647
Soldiers
Returned, employment of, 3846, 6057
Voting of, 2651, 4689-4736, 4740-4786, 4808-4834, 4874-4887, 4889-4914
165th Regiment, 1725
Bathurst harbour improvements, 3872
Budget, 863, 870
Trade conditions, 863
Free wheat, 864, 870
The Minister of Inland Revenue, 879
Amendment of Mr. Turriff, 881
Canadian Government railways
Branch lines, 2228, 2232
Cars for, 4928
Employees, promotion of, 762
Intercolonial railway
Coal, freight rates on, 3511
Maritime Express service, 8
Passenger service, 2207
Canadian Northern railway, acquisition of, 4230, 4248, 4486, 4837, 4990-5015, 5108
Capital punishment, 631
Civil servants, enlisted—pay and separation allowances, 664, 2252
Civil Service
Officials, proposed dismissal of, 3633
Salaries, 1791, 2012

Pugsley, Hon. W.—*Con.*
Coal
Prices and supply, 665, 2092
Maritime Provinces, in, 4063, 5085
Transportation of, 4138
Coastal regulations, 1912
Conscription, 1555
United States citizens, of, 1743
Criminal Code amendments, jurors, 4293, 4334
Customs, duties payable by provincial governments, 2121, 2133
Daylight saving, 2945
Divorced persons, re-marriage of, 46, 1383, 1524
Dominion Lands Act Amendment, 3796
Dredging, 5096
Drill halls, control of, 4146
Dry docks, 4455, 5772, 5888, 5917
Fish and fisheries
Licenses, 2150
Lobsters, 4171
Sardine fisheries, 4168
Flint, Dr., retirement of, 6044
Food control, 2091
Free wheat, 864, 870
Fuel, 1421
Game in the Northwest, 3670
Grosse Isle quarantine station, 5306
Hansard, correction of statement in, 6067
Members' sessional indemnity, 6048
Morning sittings, 2619
Stenographers, 5788
Hudson Bay railway, 5086
Immigration, 2141, 2146
Imperial Munitions Board, imports, 1978
Imperial War Conference, visit of Prime Minister to, 1551
Indian lands, 1908
Insurance, 3849, 3864, 4138, 5198
Landry, Mr. Justice, findings of, 3109, 3609, 5265
See under this title, McLeod-Tellier
Lighthouse keepers' salaries, 6049
Live stock exchanges, 5504
Loans to farmers, 1962
Loans, public ($100,000,000), 342
Mail contracts, 3635
McLeod-Tellier Commission, 5245, 5265
See under this title, Landry, Mr. Justice
Military Service, 2642, 3254
Appeals, 3175, 3181
Classes, 3144, 3287
Definitions, 3111
Enforcement, 2651
Enlistments, voluntary, 2647
Exemptions, 3209, 3213

Pugsley, Hon. W.—*Con.*
Militia Act, 2643
Persons liable for service, 3123
Referendum, 2651
Soldiers, voting of, 2651
Tribunals, 3164, 3574
National Service Commission, remuneration to officials of, 309, 457
Newspaper reports, correction of, 5273
Order of the day, reinstatement of, 2877
Ottawa public buildings
Rents paid by Government, 4149, 5097
Telephone service, 4147
Overseas Military Forces, Minister of, 4446
Packages, marking of—inspection and sale,—4065
Parcel post, 2072
Parliament, extension of term of, 3468, 3475
Parliamentary secretaryships, 4452
Peace proposals, 300
Potatoes, removal of duty on, 703
Provincial legislators, **free** transportation for, 684
Public Works Department
Estimates and expenditure, 3871, 5414, 5306, 5413
Quebec, railways, operating expenses of, 5452
Railway Act, The, 606
Railways, material for use in France, 1826
St. John harbour improvements, 3875, 5349, 5413
Shipbuilding, 665, 703, 1371, 1551, 1775, 1912-1928, 2293, 5432-5452
Soldier Settlement Board, 3618
Steamship services, 2292
Supply, voting one-sixth for 1917-18, 2946
Supreme Court, allowances to Chief Justice, 6050
Taxation
Business profits, 1636
Income, 4089
Wealth, 3471, 3475
Telegraph and telephone service, 5364, 5401
Toronto, Hamilton and Buffalo railway, 2616
Toronto News, statement of, 4959
Vancouver harbour improvement, 5304
Volunteers to operate trains in France, position of, 5123
War charities, 5482
War supplies
Munitions, 5527
Ross Rifle, 501
War-time Elections Bill, 5629, 5640, 5657, 5751-5771

Pugsley, Hon. W.—*Con.*
Wealth, conscription of, 3471, 3475
Woman suffrage, 309, 672, 759, 1482, **1521**, 1594 1627, 4958

Pugsley, Lieut. J. A., position of, 4895

Pulp and paper
Newsprint, fixing of price of, 1302

Quarantine service, 3756

Quebec (City)
Firearms in hardware stores, 5083
Harbour master, 897
Immigration agents, 5122

Quebec (Province)
Bridges, 3889
Electoral lists, 6002
Judges' salaries, 5798
Military districts Nos. 3 and 10, 455
Public Works. *See that title*
Recruiting in, 94, 112, 119, 127, 147, 160, 185, 213, 221, 342, 363, 2398, 2424, 2515
Officers, recruiting of, 3135
See Military Service Bill *and* French Canadian

Quebec Montmorency and Charlevoix Railway, completion and operation of, 4948, 5452

Quebec and Oriental railway, 1674

Quebec and Saguenay railway
Bondholders, 669
Completion and operation of, 303, 668, 1575, 4948, 5452
Expenditure, 1658
Legislation concerning, proposed, 458

Quebec Harbour Advances Bill. Res., 435. 1r., 438. 2r., 577. Com., 577. 3r., 578

Quebec Harbour Commission, 436

Racing Form, The, exclusion from mails of, 306, 336, 896

Racing meets, limitation of. *See* Criminal Code Amendment Bills

Radiotelegraph service. *See* Telegraphs, *also* Ocean Telegraph Act

Railway Act Amendment Bills
1. Bill No. 13, Mr. Cochrane, general. 1r., 194; 2r., 602; special committee, 602; motion to amend, stands, 605; com., 3420, 3511, 3592, 3716; 3r., 3740
2. Bill No. 18, Mr. McCraney, free transportation for provincial legislators. 1r., 300. 2r., 685. Ref. to Railway Com., 685

Railway Commission, 1862, 3407

Railway mail clerks. *See* Post office

Railways
Alleged advance to Company, 2100
Bridges, 3889

Railways—*Con.*
Cattle getting on tracks, **3549**
Coal
Confiscation of, by, 584
Handling of, by, 3395, 3402
Constables, 3599
Employees, payment of salaries of, 5956
Expenditure on, 2233
Fires from locomotives, 3552, 3602
French language, printing of literature in, 3511
Material, removal of to France, 310, 335, 1229, 1266, 1372, 1473, 1474, 1615, 1628, 1690, 1820, 3407, 3409, 5293
Overdue trains, notice of, 3594
Situation, 2219, 2221, 4011, 4058, 4217, 4247, 4467, 4512, 4566, 4622, 4835
Cost of inquiry into, 3408
Traffic, congestion of, 587
For Canadian Government railways, see that title
For individual railways, see their titles

Railways and Canals
Department
Estimates, staff and salaries, 2202, 3385, 3402, 4925, 4928, 5428
Steamers purchased by, 669

Rainbow, His Majesty's Canadian Ship, 457, 1472
See Naval Service

Rainville, Mr. Joseph H. (Deputy Speaker)
Emigration to the United States, 3285
Military service
Classes, 3285
Exemptions, 3189, 3194, 3218
Farmers, of, 6002
See Deputy Speaker

Ralston, Major J. L., position and pay of, 6067

Rankin, Captain Ramsay, position of, 987

Recruiting. *See* Army
For recruiting by localities, see names of localities

Reid, Hon. J. D. (Minister of Customs)
Canadian Government railways
Intercolonial, management of, 769
Passenger service, 2207
Promotion of employees, 769
Quebec, 4948, 5452, 5458
Civil Service appointments, 644, **1023**
Coal, confiscation of by railways, 585
Customs
Crown goods, duties payable on, 1978-1985, 2119
Departmental estimates, staff and salaries, 643, 1843, 1881, 5098, 5777
Disposal of unclaimed goods, 3743

Reid, Hon. J. D.—*Con.*
Imperial Munitions Board imports, 1978
Montreal collectorship, 648
Revenue cruisers, 1882
Dredging, 5096
Dry docks, 5771
Flint, Dr., retirement of, 6044
House of Commons—sessional indemnity of Members, 6047
Naval Service Department estimates, 660
Pensions, 6004, 6533
Public Works Department estimates, 5104, 5304, 5314, 5362
Railway Act Amendment Bills, 5997
Schaffner, Mr. L. P., dismissal of, 440
Shipbuilding, 5440, 5453
Spittal, Major, dismissal of, 646, 651
Telegraph and telephone lines, 5362
Reid, Lance Corporal, allowances to, 717
Renault, Raoul, appointment of, 2361
Repatriation of Canadians, 803
Research Council Bill. 1r., 2357. 2r., 3905. Com., 3909. 3r., 3957
Restigouche river, bridging of, 988
Returns, complaints of delay in bringing down, 1373
Rhodes, Hon. Edgar N. (Cumberland). *See* Speaker
Richmond county medical officers, 3758
Rideau canal
Lighting of, 1939
Pretoria Avenue bridge, 4926
Rimouski
Medical officers, 4509
Public works engineer, 4244
Recruiting officers, 456
Riou, Mr. C. S., payments to, 3904
Riviere du Loup-Tadoussac ferry, 452, 2358
Riviere Ouelle-Murray bay steamship service, 643
Robb, Mr. James A. (Huntingdon)
Bags, duty on, 1867-1881
Bran and middlings, duty on. 1867-1881
Budget, 969, 1317, 1319
Tariff changes, 969, 971
Free wheat, 970
Duty on mill feeds, 971
Canadian Northern railway, acquisition of, 5055
Farm labour, 3509
Free wheat, 970
Grain for breweries and distilleries, 1182
Harbour facilities, 4190
Live stock exchanges, 5507
National Transcontinental freight rates 3394
Rural mail service, 3641
Taxation—income, 4106
Robb, P. A., employment of, 1572
Robidoux, Mr. Ferdinand J. (Kent, N.B.)
Military service, 2703
Authority of Parliament, 2703
Enlistment in Quebec, 2704
Telegraph and telephone lines, 5380
Robinson, Captain J. T., appointment of, 1377
Roche, Hon. W. J. (Minister of the Interior)
Agricultural labourers from the United States, 1194
British Columbia Indian Commission, 653
Dominion Lands Act Amendment Bill, 159, 2832, 3793-3817
Farm labour, 3507
Frank, Alta., moving of residences at, 4919
French-Canadians in the United States, 4914
Game in the Northwest, 3665, 4659
Homestead regulations, 1741, 1747
Immigration
Agents, 1738
Chinese, 843, 2139
Department estimates, 4914
Regulations, 449, 525
Indians, 2340, 2349
Department estimates, 1886
Sydney reserve, 3663
See Indians
Interior Department
Employees, political activities of, 2350
Estimates, 652, 1344, 1735
French-speaking employees of, 2341
Orders in Council relating to, 6000
Migratory birds, 2525, 3657
Seed grain collections, 2352
Soldier Settlement Act, administration of, 4917
Soldier Settlement Board, 686, 1157, 2653, 3618, 3779
Surveys, 1345, 1735
United States' head tax on Canadians, 892
Rogers, Lt.-Col. Maynard, salary of, 1818
Rogers, Hon. Robert (Minister of Public Works)
Dry docks, 4456, 5915
Ottawa Citizen, statement of, 599
Public works
Buildings, 4145, 4181
Department: estimates, staff and salaries,, 3866, 3882, 3893, 4145, 4181, 5104
Harbours and rivers, 3866, 3882, 4187
Roads and bridges, 3888
Resignation from the Cabinet, 4736
Ross, Mr. Duncan C. (West Middlesex)
Army
Officers, surplus, 3104
Soldiers, votes for, 1393
Substitutes, buying of, 3113

Ross, Mr. D. C.—*Con.*
Food control, 3045
Assistants to Food Controller, 4244
Industrial and scientific research, 5284
Military service, 3041
Army Act regulations, 3113
Exemptions, 3224
Persons liable for service, 3126
Tribunals, 3170
Taxation
Income, 4652
Wealth, 3045
Unclaimed bank balances, 1001
War supplies, horses, 453
War-time Elections Bill, 5677, 5687
William Davies Co., 4151

Ross rifle. *See* War supplies

Rouville county mail carrier, 608

Roy, Judge L. R., payments to, 1130

Royal Assent, The, 603, 3766, 5084

Royal Astronomical Society of Canada, 5304

Royal Military College, 5310

Royal Mint, Ottawa branch, 1474

Royal Naval College, 4163

Royal Northwest Mounted Police
Pensions, 5704
Salaries and contingencies, 4147
Saskatchewan and Alberta, duties in, 301, 335
Subsistence, etc., 4667

Ruisseau le Blanc breakwater, 898

Russell, Mr. T. A., purchase of motor trucks by, 266, 280

Salt. *See* Fish

Salter, R. J., payments to, 1472

Sand Point wharf, 5316

Sauve, Pte. James, application of for pension, 5776

Savings banks, deposits in, 4685

St. Charles de Caplan wharf, 898

St. Charles river dam, 2525

St. Jerome post office, 899

St. John and Quebec Railway Act Amendment Bill. 1r., 2433. 2r., Com., 3r., 3401

St. John harbour improvements, 3875, 4185, 5347, 5411, 5890

St. Lawrence Flour Mills Company, Government contracts with, 4509

Sainte Luce. Changing of name, 673

St. Maurice river improvements, 1381

St. Peter's canal, 3406

St. Pierre-Miquelon mail service, 3649

St. Roch Traverse lightkeeper, 1378

St. Romuald public works, 1129

Schaffner, Mr. F. L. (Souris)
Army, enlistment of unfit men, 4004
Canadian Northern railway, acquisition of, 5061
Cattle, British embargo on, 918
Civil Service, 2246
Daylight saving, 3683
Flour prices, 5214
Grain, rust in, 2067
Military service, exemptions, 3365
Ottawa public buildings, 4150
Public headth, 1001
Rural mail carriers, 2247
Taxation
Farm implements, 1713
Income, 4096

Schaffner, Mr. L. P., dismissal of, 438

School lands, western, 1378

Scientific and Industrial research. *See* Research Council Bill

Scotch Hill post office, 3649

Scout, motor boat, 5271

Scott, Mr. F. S. (South Waterloo)
Budget, 884
Canada and the war, 885
Free wheat, 885
Present prosperity, 886

Secretary of State, Department of the, estimates, 655, 3737, 5242

Security Life Insurance Company Bill. 1r., 2479. 2r., 2592. Com., 3r., 2857

Seed grain, 302, 303, 305
See Grain

Seguin, Mr. Paul A. (L'Assomption)
Enlistments, 1476, 1572
Military Service Bill, 2765

Senate
Appointments to, 924
Hansard, cost of, 1571
Proposed change in constitution of, 1131
Taxation measures, precedent in amendment denied, 5480, 5883

Sévigny, Hon. Albert (Minister of Inland Revenue)
Army camps, sale of liquor in, 837
Inland Revenue Department
Estimates, 2360, 3817
Expenditure, 2379
Military service, 2636
Exceptions, 3572
Quebec, recruiting in, 2638, 3256

Sévigny, Hon. A.—*Con.*
Privilege—statement concerning effects removed from Speaker's chambers after Parliament Buildings fire, 2058
Renault, Raoul, appointment of, 2361
Telegraph and telephone lines, 5385, 5391
Sexsmith, Mr. John A. (East Peterborough)
Agriculture and Colonization, report of Committee, 1956
Railway Act, The, 3443, 3543, 3546, 3605
Telegraphs and telephones, 3543, 3546
Shaw, F. D., dismissal of, 1847
Sherbrooke exhibition grounds, 302
Shigawake post office, 898
Shigawake East post office, 988
Shipbuilding
British Government, for, 4164
Canadian-built ships, 591
Prince Rupert, at, 4787
Railway Department, for, 4939, 5429
See Marine
Shipping. *See* Marine *and* Transportation
Shore, George, suspension of sentence on, 1373
Sinclair, Mr. John H. (Guysborough)
Address in reply to the Governor General's Speech, 150
The fiftieth anniversary of Confederation, 150
The winning of the war, 151
Canadian soldiers at the front, 152
Military record of the Government, 152
The Ross rifle, 154
Political patronage, 154
Commandeering of ships, 155
Small arms ammunition, 156
Extension of term of Parliament, 157
Army
Casualties, July, 1917, 4151
Enlistments, July, 1917, 4151
Medical service, 3969
Officers, surplus of, 3102
Recruiting, 2884
Soldiers, age of on enlisting, 4001
Canada Temperance Act, 5243
Canadian Government railways, ice for, 301
See, under this title, Intercolonial
Canadian Northern railway, acquisition of, 4600, 4872, 5061
Civil servants, enlisted, pay and separation allowances to, 663
Civil Service, 649
Appointments under sec. 21, 607, 1023, 1351, 1937
Coalition government, 2887
Customs Department staff, and expenditure, 649, 1845
Sinclair, Mr. J. H.—*Con.*
Dredges, 668, 1025, 5405
Fish and fisheries
Advisory Board, 2152
Bounties, 457
Development of industry, 2040
Exports, 454
Investigation of problems, 5288
Laws, violation of, 2389
Lobsters, packing of, 5427
Marketing, 2042
Salt, 1027, 2044, 2290
Telephone method, 2176
Transportation, 3392, 4933
Trawlers, 300
Food inspectors, 607
Government Railways Act amendment, 4371
Grain, seed, 4680
Guysborough public building, 5914
Heatherton mail contract, 1817
High cost of living, 707
Hudson Bay railway expenditure, 596
Immigration regulations, 312, 525
Inland Revenue Department officials, 758
Intercolonial railway
Appointment of officials, 658
Branch lines, 3386
Tracadie siding, 2618
Intoxicating liquors, prosecutions for sale of, 1575
Manitoba County Court judges,, 5083
Margaree harbour improvements, 5332
McCutcheon, Stanley, dismissal of, 306
Migratory birds, 3661
Military District No. 6, 5236
Military service
Appeals, 3179
Classes, 3141
Referendum, 2881
Tribunals, 3157
Military Voters' Bill, 4694, 4726, 4728, 4758-4786
Navigation, training in, 1839
Nickerson, W. H., 1472
Nova Scotia judges, 6003
Ottawa Journal, statement in, 4927
Overseas Military Forces, Minister of, 4445
Parliament, extension of term of, 157
Pensions, 6030
Political patronage, 154
Pollution of streams, 454
Public Works Department estimates, 3868, 3874
Quebec and Saguenay railway, 668
Quebec harbour advances, 437
Railway Act, The, 3526, 3529
Railway Commission, appeals from, 1863
Rainbow, steamship, 1472

Sinclair, Mr. J. H.—*Con.*
Returns, delay in bringing down of, 1373
Ross rifle, 154, 425, 451
Rural mail service, 5898
St. John harbour works, 5896
Salt for fish curing, 1027, 2290
Sand Point wharf, 5316
Savings banks deposits, 4685
Shipbuilding, 1671, 1923, 5434, 5452
Small arms ammunition, 156, 2480
Soldiers, returned, appointment of, 6059
Soldier's Cove wharf, 5337
Sonora preventive officers, 4244
Steam trawlers, 300
Steamship services, 2288, 2300
Steele, Arthur, dismissal of, 338
Submarine situation, 1328
Superannuation payments, 595
Technical education, 1247
Telegraph and telephone lines, 5371
Toronto water-borne traffic, 454
Tracadie Inland Revenue officer, 1817
War-time Elections Bill, 5567, 6081
Welland canal, 3404
Wells, Clarence, 2480
White, N. W., payments to, 1038
Whitehead life saving station, 1469

Small Arms Ammunition. *See* War supplies

Smith, Pte. J. I., discharge of, 3418

Smith, Mr. William (South Ontario)
Army, casualties, 2201
Cattle, British embargo on, 923
National Service cards, 2479
Railway Act, The, 3442

Smith's Falls postmaster, 1570

Soldiers. *See* Army

Soldiers' Settlement Board
Advances to soldiers, 4918
Commissioners, 4917

Soldier Settlement Board Bill. Res., 1157, 2653, 3618. 1r., 3630. 2r., 3779. 3r., 3792

Sonora preventive officers, 4244

Sorel, strike at, 1912, 1935

South African War—Canadian contingent, 2200

Speaker (Hon. Edgar N. Rhodes), rulings and statements of
Adjournment motions, when in order, 5517, 5547
Amendments ruled out not subsequently debatable, 1686
Bills
Not debatable in detail on motion for leave to introduce, 4410
Printing of in both languages, 5550

Speaker—*Con.*
Censored publications, quotations from in Parliament, 5944
Closure
Bill reported amended, amendments not debatable; Rule 17A overrides Rule 56, 5771
Concurrence in resolution of Committee of Supply not debatable, 5095
Crown property, Bills to dispose of, must have Crown's consent, for third reading, 1157
Flint, Dr., retirement of, 6044
House of Commons
Estimates, 2359, 5784
Officials, 5786
Interjections, 2596
Irrelevancy, 444, 5478
Language reflecting on the Chair to be withdrawn, 2567
Letters from persons outside referring to House proceedings not to be quoted, 3956
Member must take his seat when Speaker addresses House, 4410
Motions dealing with questions already before House, 1017, 1022, 1150
Motions, irregular
Repetition of matters disposed of, 1867
Substantial repetition of notice of motion standing on order paper, 1490, 1508, 1523
Taxation, to levy, without recommendation by the Crown, 3078, 4648
Order of the day, reinstatement of, 2878, 2880
Orders of the Day, on, extended remarks irregular, 665, 804
Petitions, form for presentation of, 2284
Privilege, statements under to be confined to denial of matters complained of, 599, 3612, 3614, 3616
Questions and answers
Answers not debatable, 4959
Questions not to contain allegation of fact or inuendo, 4834
Quorum, absence of, 2877
Reply, privilege of, confined to mover of substantive motion, 1880
Order of speakers varied by unanimous consent, 1015
Rules, lenient interpretation not to establish a precedent, 3078
Saturday sittings, Committee of Supply, how constituted (Rule 17C), 5891
Senate proceedings, regularity of not to be questioned in House, 5498

Speaker—*Con.*
Taxation, amendment by Senate of a Bill; rights of House to be reserved by special declaration, 5480, 5883
Unanimous consent; change in order of Speakers permitted, 1015
Unparliamentary expressions
"A man who was ashamed, Sir, of what he was doing," 5587
"Vile motives," 4313
Votes and Proceedings, error, not immediately discovered, referred to special committee, 2880
Ways and Means, amendment to second reading of resolution reported from Committee must be relevant, 1686
See also Deputy Speaker *and* Parliamentary procedure

Spence, Andrew, position of, 1472

Spittal, Lt.-Col. C. D., dismissal of, 645, 651, 1127

Spotten, Judge, 1127

Stanfield, Mr. John (Colchester)
Army
Camps, sale of liquor in, 823
Medical service, 3984
Government railways, promotion of employees, 765

Stayner public building, 5412

Steamers utilized by British Government, the C. E. Tanner, 5362

Steamship services
Australia and New Zealand, 2285
Canada
British Columbia, 2299
Magdalen Islands, 2302, 2326
New Brunswick, 2292, 2297, 2323
Nova Scotia, 2286, 2299, 2300, 2304, 2319
Prince Edward Island, 2303, 2319, 3389, 3945
Quebec, 2299, 2318, 2325
China and Japan, 2298
France, 2307
Great Britain, 2285, 2291, 2297
Ireland, 2292
Newfoundland, 2286, 2291
South Africa, 2291
South America, 2287
United States, 2299
West Indies, 2287
See also Transportation

Steam trawlers. *See* Fish and Fisheries

Steele, Arthur, dismissal of, 338

Steele, General, appointment of, 264

Steele, Mr. Michael (South Perth)
Aerial League of the British Empire, 3633
Alcohol, on charge to medical stores, loss of, 2776
Army, soldiers, voting of, 1383, 4825
Canadian Association of Stationary Engineers, 1198
Cheese purchases, 2258
Coal, shortage of, 83
Cold storage, 2079
Gordon Divorce Bill, 5496
Imperial Order Daughters of the Empire, 5495
Public health, proposed department of, 992
Railway Act, The, 3442, 3452
Scientific and industrial research, 3909

Stefansson expedition, 4173

Stellarton, N.S.
Postmaster, 669, 897, 3758
Public building, 4951

Stevens, Mr. H. H. (Vancouver)
Address in reply to the Governor General's Speech, 62
Our troops at the front, 62
Reply to criticisms of Mr. Macdonald, 62
The Ross rifle, 63
National Service Commission, 64
The smelting and refining of ores, 66
Care of returned soldiers, 67
Army, soldiers, voting of, 4749
Canadian Northern Railway acquisition of, 4965
Enlistment, 2421-2428
Fisheries, proposed ministry of, 2029
Grain for breweries and distilleries, 1182
Indians, Kitsilano Reserve, 1902
Military Service, 2421
Enlistment, interference with, 2421
Labour's attitude, 2426
Quebec's attitude, 2424, 2428
Referendum, 2427
National Service Commission, 64
Ross rifle, 63
Shipbuilding, 5445
Telephone lines, 5402
Wealth, conscription of, 2427
Woman suffrage, 1522

Stewart, Mr. T. J. (West Hamilton)
Toronto, Hamilton and Buffalo railway, 2590, 2609, 3865, 3955, 3980
Tractor engines, duty on, 680

Submarine situation, 1320

Sulphur, United States embargo on export of, 4889

Superannuation payments, 595

Supply Bill. *See* Appropriation Act

Supply, committee of, 353, 578-584, 643-663, 1112-1124, 1166-1176, 1344-1361, 1735-1766, 1790-1815, 1835-1862, 1881-1912, 1912-1956, 1989-2006, 2061-2099, 2149-2183, 2202-2235, 2255-2282, 2285-2320, 2323-2364, 2359-2388, 3385-3399, 3402-3417, 3633-3654, 3687-3716, 3737-3740, 3740-3757, 3817-3844, 3866-3881, 3882-3902, 3949-3955, 3962-3979, 3980-4008, 4044-4058, 4145-4150, 4157-4191, 4666-4684, 4914-4926, 4928-4951, 5098-5108, 5205-5242, 5242- 5270, 5275-5314, 5314-5360, 5362-5415, 5428-5474, 5777-5805, 5890, 5892-5900, 5948, 5997, 6004-6060
For details see titles of departments and subjects

Supreme Court Act and Exchequer Court Act amendment Bill. 1r., 2568; 2r., Com., 3r., 3630

Surveys, 1345, 1357
Astronomical, 4917
Generally, 1345, 1357, 3898
Geological, 4179
Hydrographic, 4173
Indian Lands, 1894
International, 1735

Sutherland, Mr. Donald (South Oxford)
Army camps, sale of liquor in, 829
Coalition government, 2690
Flour, price of, 1080
Live stock purchases, 2280
Military service, 2682
Classes, 3282
Quebec, recruiting in, 2685
Referendum, 2692
Railway Act, The, 3545, 3547
Railways, government operation of, 2234
Rural mail carriers, 3636
Soldier Settlement Board, 3786
Soldiers, behaviour of, 5234
Soldiers, votes for, 1395
Telegraphs and telephones, 3545
War-time Elections Bill, 5685, 5860
Women Suffrage, 1477

Swiss Army manoeuvres, attendance of Canadian officers at, 5219

Sydney
Harbour improvements, 5342
Industrial sites, 3956

Tanner, C. E., Steamer or Motor Boat, 5362

Tariff. *See* Customs *and* Customs Tariff Act

Taxation. Senate amendment of taxation measure no precedent, 5476
Special
Business profits, 719, 727, 737, 745, 750, 959, 965, 1432, 1437, 1447, 1628, 2107
Comparative statement, 2508
Cost of collecting, 4686

Taxation—*Con.*
Returns of business concern, 4245
See Wealth, Conscription of
Income, 719, 738, 1424, 1441, 1631, 1687, 3760, 3767, 4070, 4102, 4124, 4638
Cost of collecting estimated, 4686
See also Income War Tax Bill
Land, 1630
Hudson's Bay Co., lands, 986
Patent medicines, 363
Use made of funds obtained by, 4177
Wealth, 2453, 2469, 2508, 2528, 2576, 2587, 2597, 2608, 2671, 2728, 2859, 3045
See Wealth, Conscription of

Taylor, Mr. James D. (New Westminster)
Army
Medical service, 3981
Non-commissioned officers, 1608, 3999
Officers, employment of, 565
Recruiting, 565
Soldiers
Pensions, 1607
Voting of, 4703, 4757-4786
Fraser river dredging, 5357
Hindu immigration, 2145
Military service, 3145, 3275
Thomson, Mr. Levi, reply to statement of, 1370

Taylor, Lt.-Col. J. D., M.P., payments to, 986

Technical Education, 1229
See Industrial and Scientific Research.

Telegraphs, telephones and radiotelegraphs
Government lines
Alberta and Saskatchewan, 3892, 5393
British Columbia, 3893, 5365, 5395, 5410
Manitoba, 5411
Magdalen Islands cable, 5407
New Brunswick, 5379
Nova Scotia, 5362
Prince Edward Island, 5407, 5411
Quebec, 5384
Telephones for, 4147
Ocean service, 2024, 2108
Provisions governing, 3542, 3546
Radiotelegraph service, 4159
Subsidies, 3892
West India cable, 2339

Temiscouata mail contract, 335

"The Fiddlers," circulation of forbidden, 3503, 3654, 3718, 3881, 3955, 4059, 5942

Thetford Mines, labour trouble at, 590, 606, 1113

Thoburn, Mr. William (North Lanark)
Gordon Divorce Bill, 5909
Military service, 3358
Postmasters, salaries of, 3642
Technical education, 1238

Thompson, Mr., of Winnipeg, employment of, 4008

Thompson, Mr. Alfred (Yukon)
Game in the Northwest, 3668
Yukon, cost of living in, 2571

Thompson, Dr. Alfred, M.P., employment and salary of, 5083

Thomson, Mr. Levi (Qu'Appelle)
Army, soldiers' pay, 3216
Budget, 976
The duty on farm machinery, 977
Inequalities in the tariff, 979
Free wheat, 982
Canadian Northern railway, acquisition of, 5148
Dominion Lands Act amendment, 3811
Free wheat, 982
Military service, 2993
Exemptions, 3193, 3225
Railway transportation for Members of Parliament, 3521, 3523
Soldier Settlement Board, 3629

Thornton, Mr. Charles J. (Durham)
Packages, marking of,—inspection and sale,—4066
Railway Act, The, 3544
Telegraphs and telephones, 3544

Three Rivers
Harbour improvements, 3879
Public buildings, 662

Titus, Private John, 2237

Tobin, Mr. Edmund W. (Richmond and Wolfe)
Bromptonville postmaster, 1129
Canadian Northern railway, acquisition of, 5052
Horses for war purposes, 1120
Military service, 2810
Militia Department motor cars, 2525
Ross rifle, 2054
Telegraph and telephone lines, 5388
Wool, exportation of, 1130

Toronto water-borne traffic, 454

Tracadie
Inland Revenue officer, 1817
Railway siding, 2618

Tractor engines, duty on, 674

Trade and Commerce
Agents and commissioners, 2326
Department of
Estimates, 1835, 2285, 2323, 3687, 3737, 5205, 5275
Publications, 5275
Foreign trade
France, 597, 2307
South America, 2331

Transportation
West Indies, 2288
Coal, of, vessels for, 4791
Grain, 3712
Lake and ocean freight rates, 3715
Legislators, for, 4935
Problems, report of Royal Commission on, 1012
Terminal facilities, 4189
See also Marine, Railways, Shipbuilding, *and* Steamship Services

Tremain, Lieut.-Col. H. B., M.P., pay and allowances to, 608, 1472

Trent canal, 759, 2206, 3405, 3417

Trenton, N.S., contractors for war supplies at, 303

Truax, Mr. R. E. (South Bruce)
Brampton-Palestine mail route, 590
Military Service Bill, 3048
Royal Mint, Ottawa branch, 1474

Turgeon, Mr. Onésiphore (Gloucester)
Army—dental corps, 4008
Budget, 1108, 1194, 1201
Government railways, 1108
Canada's prosperity, 1195
Taxation, 1197, 1201
Protection or free trade, 1197
Conservative and Liberal policies contrasted, 1203
Duty on potatoes and flour, 1204
Free wheat, 1205
The shipping industry, 1206
Canadian Northern railway, acquisition of, 5029
Caraquet and South Shore railway, 3387
Flour, duty on, 1204
Free wheat, 1205
Goldman, Mr. I., 4510
Insurance, 4390
Intercolonial railway, operation of, 795
Lobsters, 2050
Military service, 2667
Classes, 3354
Exceptions, 3572
Overseas Military Forces, Minister of, 4434
Potatoes, duty on, 1204
Salt, shortage of, 1319
Senate, proposed change in constitution of, 1143
Shipbuilding, 1931
Shipping industry, 1206
Soldiers, returned appointment of to government positions, 1858
Soldiers, votes for, 1394
Taxation—business profits, wealth, income, 1197, 1201, 2671
War-time Elections Bill, 5557

Turriff, Mr. John G. (Assiniboia)
Address in reply to the Governor General's Speech, 175
The fiftieth anniversary of Confederation, 175
Extension of term of Parliament, 175
National government, 177
Taxation of war profits, 178
The Nationalist party, 179
Recruiting in Quebec, 185
Enlistment of Canadians, 187
The manufacture of munitions, 188
Cost of the war to Canada, 189
Extension of term of Parliament, 189
Increased production, 190
National service, 191
Recruiting from the Civil Service, 192
The Ross rifle, 193
Aliens, naturalization of, 3814
Anderson, Mr. Daniel, 1265
Army
Officers, surplus of, 3103
Rejected men, 3099
Ashcroft mail service, 668
Assistant Deputy Minister of Labour, suspension of, 687
Beans for seed, 1473
Blow, Dr., payments to, 668
Budget, 746
Trade relations with Great Britain, 746
Free wheat, 747, 750
Government expenditure, 747
Taxation of business profits, 750
Revenue of Canada, 755
Canadian Northern railway, acquisition of, 5026
Civil Service
Disfranchisement of Civil servants, proposed, 2020
Recruiting from, 192
Daylight saving, 3684
Dominion Lands Act amendment, 3798
Farm labour for western Canada, 3504
Flour, price of, 1070
Food Control, 1999, 3751
Fuel, 1414
Grain
Breweries and distilleries, for, 1180
Commission, 1381
Elevators, 3707
Grading of, 1265
Rust in, 2063
Wheat
Free, 747, 756
Surplus, purchase of, 1126
United States tariff on, 1342
Hobbs, Mr. Hugh, 1228
Loans to farmers, 1968
Lockhart, Mr. Hugh, 1265

Turriff, Mr. J. G.—*Con.*
Mails, alleged misuse of, 893, 1027
Matthews, Mr. L., 1228
Military service, 3719
Exemptions, 3192, 3272
National service, 191
O'Connor, Mr. W. F., report of, 3751
Palmerston post office, 1127
Parliament, extension of term of, 189
Patent records, 2063
Pensions, revision, 5424
Potatoes for seed, 1473
Proportional representation, 902
Quebec and Saguenay railway, 1658
Railway Department estimates, 3410
Robinson, J. T., 1377
Ross rifle, 193, 489
Saskatchewan coal miners' strike, 3237
Senate, proposed change in constitution of, 1137
Smith, Pte. J. I., 3418
Soldier Settlement Board, 3779
Spotten, Judge, 1127
Taxation
Business profits, 178, 750, 1458
Income, 1463
Tractor engines, duty on, 678
National Transcontinental railway, operation of, 657
War
Prisoners of, parcels to, 3958
Prosecution of the, 1591
War-time Elections Bill, 5711, 5836
Woman suffrage, 1518

Turner, General, appointment of, 268, 279

Turner, Mr. Harvey, position of, 1469

Union Government
See Coalition Government; National Government

United Mines Workmen of Nova Scotia, 802

United States
British subjects in, recruiting of, 2482, 3904
Declaration of war by, 610
Exodus of Canadians to, 3285
Farm labourers from, 665, 1740, 1747, 1193, 4512
French Canadians in, 4914
Head tax on foreigners entering, 892, 1266
Tariff
Changes in, 1264
Wheat, on, 1342
Troops, training of, in Canada, 2482

Universal Radio Syndicate Limited. *See* Ocean Telegraph Act

Urquhart, Mr. Hector, dismissal of, 5367

Vancouver
Dredging in False Creek, 900, 1126
Drill Hall site, 456
Harbour Commissioners, 1575
Harbour improvements, 5304
Venereal diseases, 817, 839, 869
Verville, Mr. Alphonse (Maisonneuve)
Army, soldiers, attendance of, at public meetings, 5231
Assistant Deputy Minister of Labour, suspension of, 686
Canadian Northern Railway acquisition of, 5066
Civil Service salaries, 2245
Cold storage, 2089
Food control, 1989, 2089
High cost of living, 710
House of Commons, sessional indemnity of Members, 6047
Labour
Attitude of on Military service, 2795
Requirements, 2799
Military Service, 2795
Moore, Major Rev. A. H., 1265
Tariff revision, 1789
Taxation, income, 4103, 4121, 4130
Technical education, 1237
Thetford Mines labour trouble, 590, 606, 1120
War-time Elections Bill, 5741
Veterans
Army and Navy, Bill, 5421
Victoria bridge toll rates, 672
Victoria, B.C.
Breakwater, 1381
Victoria Sealing Company, 5958
Viviani, M., visit and address to Parliament of, 1318, 1361, 1362
Votes for soldiers. *See* Army, Soldiers
Voters Lists
Provision for under War-time Elections Bill, 5418
Walsh, J. J., payments to, 1675
War
Charities. *See* Charities Bill
Defence of Canada. *See* Militia and Defence
Expenditure, 274, 354, 386, 408, 476, 522, 525, 549, 718, 2936
See also War Appropriation Bill
Loans, 720, 2774
Minister of Overseas Services, proposed, 277, 279
Pay and Records office, 1355
Prisoners of, 666
Arrangements for exchange of, 4194
War—*Con.*
Money orders for, 714
Parcels for, 714, 3958
Prosecution of the, 2320, 3371, 3375
Motion of Mr. Currie, 1576
Submarine situation, 1320
Taxes
See Taxation
Supplies
Boots, 4062
Clothing, 556, 3556
Davidson Commission, 249
Equipment, 40, 262
Hay, 338
Horses, 453, 1093
Machine guns, 590, 2201
Mattresses and covers, 6065
Methods of purchase, 232, 265
Motor trucks, 262, 266, 280, 558
Munitions, 31, 36, 188, 4928, 5517, 5541
Rifles
Importations of, 1125
Ross, 63, 154, 193, 228, 235, 451, 2451, 3487
Correspondence brought down, 7
Factory, 663, 1265
In Committee (statement by Prime Minister), 388-434; resumed, 477-522
Substitute for, 1012, 1594
Small arms ammunition, 156, 2480
Supplies
Patronage in purchase of, 4050, 4053
Pictou contractors for, 303
Trenton contractors for, 303
Transports, 1280
Transportation of, 33, 36
Trophies, exhibition of, 6003
Wagons, 556
See War Purchasing Commission
War Appropriation ($500,000,000) Bill. Res., 354, 386, 408, 476. 1r., 522. 2r., 525. Com., 525, 549. 3r., 585
War Charities Bill. 1r., 5242. 2r., 5424. Com., 5424, 5481, 6062. 3r., 6065
See also p. 378
War Purchasing Commission, 32, 340
See War Supplies
War Revenue Act
Prosecutions under, 2379, 3835
See Inland Revenue Department, Estimates
War-time Elections Bill. 1r., 5415. 2., 5550, 5565. Com., 5637, 5706. 3r., 5805, 5806
Closure applied, 5565, 5706, 5806

War-time Elections Bill—*Con.*
Amendments proposed: Sir Wilfrid Laurier, 5576; lost on div., 5628. Mr. Pugsley, 5629; lost on div., 5635. Mr. Neely, 5650; lost, 5659. Mr. McCraney, 5659; lost on div., 5660. Mr. Lapointe, lost on div., 5770. Mr. Neely, 5824; lost on div., 5879
Senate amdts., 6071

War-time Elections Act
Female enumerators, 6071
Polling Divisions, 6070
Qualifications of voter, 6092
Tribunals, candidates for federal elections serving on, 6070

Washington Conference, Canadian delegates to, 1127

Waterford, N. S., explosion at, 5775

Ways and Means, Committee of, 584, 1436, 1445, 1628, 3760, 5242, 6061
Amendment, Mr. Oliver, 1677
See Budget and Taxation

Wealth, Conscription of
Amendments to address for extension of term of Parliament, Mr. Graham, 3641, 3471, 3480
Statement by Finance Minister, 3187
See Taxation

Webb, Lieutenant, position of, 4563

Webster, Mr. John (Brockville)
Army, 122nd Battalion, 5083
Budget, 953
The dairying industry, 953
Canada's part in the war, 956
Cheese, manufacture and sale of, 2268
Packages, marking of—inspection and sale, 4068

Weichel, Mr. William G. (North Waterloo)
Military Service Bill, 2801
National Transcontinental Railway, ties, 455
War-time Elections Bill, 5832

Weights and measures, inspection of, 2383, 3842

Welland canal
Construction of, 2206, 3402, 4925
Dynamiters of, 4926

West Edmonton forest rangers and homestead inspectors, 1476

Western Canada, farm labour for, 3504

Wheat. *See* Grain

White, Rev. Ward, position of, 3903

White, Sir Thomas (Minister of Finance)
Address in reply to the Governor General's Speech, 272
Reply to statements of Sir Sam Hughes, 272
War expenditure, 274
Proposed Minister of Overseas Services, 277, 279
Appointment of General Turner, 279, 280
Purchase of motor trucks and transports, 280
Canada and the war, 282
Army
Camps, sale of liquor in, 818
Medical service, commission of inquiry into, 542
Soldiers, life insurance of, 3589
Officers, unattached, 563
Beans, duty on, 671
Bran and shorts, duty on, 1870
British Government and Canadian Pacific Railway Financial arrangement Bill, 1369, 2059
Budget, 718, 937
National income and expenditure, 718
War expenditure, 718
Income taxation, 719
Taxation of business profits, 719
War loans, 720
Trade of Canada, 721
Free wheat, 937
Amendment of Mr. Oliver, 949
Business Profits War Tax, 5290
Canadian Northern railway, acquisition of, 4011, 4217, 4247-4287, 4467, 4595-4620, 4622-4638, 4835-4873, 4960-5015, 5154
Canadian Pacific railway—Bill to facilitate financial arrangements, etc., 1369, 2059
Civil Service
Enlistments from, 2014, 2253
Promotions, 2010
Salaries, 2008, 2238
Civil Service Act amendment, 2008, 2238
Customs Tariff Act amendment, proposed, 1689
Enlistment, voluntary, 2583
Finance, Department of, estimates, 1790, 1796
Flour, price of, 1053, 1088
Fuel, 1419
Grand Trunk Pacific railway, loan to, 5292
Rails, removal of from, 5296
Hughes, Sir Sam, reply to statement of, 3110
Military Service Bill, 2582
Voluntary enlistment, 2583
Progress of the war, 2584

White, Sir T.—*Con.*
Canada's position, 2584
Our duty to the men at the front, 2585
Conscription of wealth, 2587
Referendum proposals, 2589
Income War Tax Bill
See, under this title, Taxation
Inland Revenue Department estimates, 2381, 3832
Insurance, 1724, 2100
Life insurance of soldiers, 3589
Insurance Act Amendment Bills, 3848, 4138, 5196
Loans to farmers, 1960
Loans, public, 720
$100,000,000 for Public Service, 342, 435, 4957
Amount received and commission paid, 4957
McNab, Colin C., 579
Members, deceased, tributes to, 5
Motor trucks, purchase of, 280
National Gallery of Canada, 5301
Newsprint paper, 757, 1646
Penny Bank Act, 2061
Pensions, 845
Denial of erroneous statement, 5423
Proportional representation, 908
Quebec and Saguenay railway, 1658
Railway, situation in Canada, 4011, 4058
Recruiting, retarding of, 3110
Senate, appointments to, 930
Shipbuilding, 666
Imperial Munitions Board contracts, 1661
Soldier Settlement Board, 3788
Supply, vote for three months, 2946
Tariff revision, 1689
Taxation measures; Senate amendment no precedent, 5476
Taxation
Business profits, 178, 719, 1438, 1635, 2108
Returns by business concerns, 4246
Income, 719, 1441, 1449, 1631, 3760, 3768, 4070, 4102, 4126, 4638
Wealth, 2587
Toronto Globe, correction of editorial in, 2707
Unclaimed bank balances, 1004
United Grain Growers, Limited, 894
War charities, 5424, 5481
War expenditure, 718
War finance, vote of $500,000,000, 542
War supplies for British Government, 4953, 5522
War taxation
See, under this title, Taxation

White, Sir T.—*Con.*
Wealth, conscription of, 3187
See, under this title, Taxation

Whitehead life-saving station, 1469

Williams Head quarantine station, 5312

Wilcox, Mr. Oliver J. (North Essex)
Racing meets, limitation of, 8, 313
Toronto Globe—correction of statement in, 47
Tractor engines, duty on, 676

Wilfrid C., vessel, 4062

William Davies Co., 4151
See Food Investigation

Wilson, Mr. Charles A. (Laval)
Canadian Northern railway, acquisition of, 5069
Criminal Code amendment, jurors, 4300, 4326
Military Service Bill, 2925
Contraventions of Act, 3328
Exemptions, 3303
Quebec, recruiting in, 2926
Penitentiaries, salaries of guards, 5803
Potato consignments, 607
Railway Act, The, 3444, 3447
Ships built in Canada, 591
Soldiers, voting of, 4722
Taxation, income, 4073

Wilson, Mr. Gordon C. (Wentworth)
Address in reply to the Governor General's Speech, 9
Canada and the war, 9
Tribute to deceased Member, 10
Provision for returned soldiers, 10
National service, 10
Canada's financial stability, 11
Fiftieth anniversary of Confederation, 11
Toronto, Hamilton and Buffalo railway, 2610

Windsor, N.S.
Tribune building, 1380
Wharf repairs, 1380

Windsor, Ontario, immigration officers, 2357

Windsor Junction, N.S., mail service, 5913

Wireless telegraph. *See* Telegraphs

Woman suffrage
Enfranchisement under War-time Elections Bill, 5416
Pugsley, Mr., motion and amendments by
Notice stands, 309; postponed, 672, 759
Amendment to motion of Mr. Sutherland, 1488
Ruled out by Mr. Speaker, 1490, 1508
Amendment to amendment of Sir Robert Borden, 1522

Woman suffrage—*Con.*
Sutherland, Mr., motion of, 1477, 1627
Borden, Sir Robert, amendment of, 1508
Inquiry by Mr. Pugsley, 4958

Women
Atlantic passports for, 3996, 5783
Munition workers, 4063

Wood, Lieutenant, position of, 4563

Wool, exportation of, 1130

Wright, Mr. William (Muskoka)
Grain, 5208
Wheat, fixing price of, 3694, 3703
Live stock exchanges, 5512
Public Works Department estimates, 5335
Railway Act, The, 3514

Wright, Mr. W.—*Con.*
Railway transportation for Members of Parliament, 3521
Soldier Settlement Board, 3629
Woman suffrage, 1479

Yarmouth harbour improvements, 3870

Year Book, Canada, 2337

Yukon territory, 1736
Administrator, 5122
Commissioner of, 3677
Expenditure, 592
Judges' salaries, 5896
Miners' strike, 3086
Population, 593
Prices and cost of living, 2199, 2237, 2481, 2571, 2954

Zinc. *See* Mines and minerals